

MAR 27 1944

Volume LIX

MARCH, 1944

Number 3

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
PAULSEN, WOLFGANG.—Zum Problem der Novelle bei Kleist,	149
MERONEY, HOWARD.—The Nine Herbs,	157
BROOKE, TUCKER.—Shakespeare's Dove-House,	160
WEBB, HENRY J.—Falstaff's Clothes,	162
MOORE, JOHN ROBERT.—Sheridan's "Little Bronze Pliny,"	164
HUDSON, RICHARD B.—Meredith's 'The Egoist' as a Play,	165
METZDORF, ROBERT F.—A New Wordsworth Letter,	168
PURCELL, J. M.—Rime in 'Paradise Lost,'	171
GLASHEEN, ADALINE E.—Shelley's First Published Review of 'Mandeville,'	172
TEMPLEMAN, WILLIAM D.—A Note on Arnold's "Civilization in the United States,"	173
STURTEVANT, A. M.—Regarding the Prefix 'ý-' in Old Norse 'ý-miss,' 'vicisem.'	175
MAGOUN, F. P., JR.—'Hymselfen lik a Pilgrym to Desiise': 'Treilus,' V, 1577,	176
LOOMIS, R. S.—Chaucer's Eight Years' Sickness,	178
JEREMY, SISTER MARY, O.P.—The English Prose Translation of 'Legenda Aurea,'	181

## REVIEWS:

CAROLINE BRADY, The Legends of Ermánaric. [Kemp Malone.]	183
RUTH B. MCJIMBY, Chaucer's Irregular -E. [H. R. Patch.]	188
SISTER MARY O'CONNOR, The Art of Dying Well. [Harry Caplan.]	191
GRACE E. MOORE, The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor. [C. G. Loosanoff.]	193
C. W. KENNEDY, The Earliest English Poetry. [Kemp Malone.]	194
ALFRED HART, Stolne and Surreptitious Copies, a Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos. [Leo Kirschbaum.]	196
J. C. ADAMS, The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment. [W. R. Johnson.]	198
C. E. WARD (ed.), The Letters of John Dryden; J. R. MOORE, Defoe's Sources for Robert Drury's Journal. [Rae Blanchard.]	200
J. BUTT and G. TILSTORON (eds.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. [L. I. Bredwold.]	202
JEAN ROBERTSON, The Art of Letter Writing. [Rush Kelso.]	203
C. S. LEWIS, A Preface to <i>Paradise Lost</i> ; R. W. CHAMBERS, Poete and Their Critics: Langland and Milton. [W. H. Parker.]	205
R. A. AUBIN (ed.), London in Flames, London in Glory. [W. H. Irving.]	206
L. L. MARTI, The Later Career of Tobias Smollett. [C. E. Jones.]	208
J. BOYD, Goethe's <i>Iphigenie auf Tauris</i> . [Victor Lange.]	209
F. A. VON HAYEK (ed.), The Spirit of the Age, by John Stuart Mill. [W. S. Knickerbocker.]	210
S. A. LARRABEE, English Bardic and Grecian Marbles. [B. H. Stern.]	211
V. E. HULL and ARCHER TAYLOR, A Collection of Welsh Riddles. [Richard Jenks.]	213

<b>BRIEF MENTION:</b> J. Q. ADAMS (ed.), <i>Oenone and Paris</i> , by T. H.; LAND COOPER (tr.), <i>Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates</i> ; B. H. BRONSON and Others, <i>Studies in the Comic</i> ; H. B. HAGSTROM, <i>The Educational Theories of John Ruskin</i> ; E. J. HOWARD and G. D. WILSON (eds.), <i>The Canterbury Tales</i> by GEOFFREY CHAUCER; G. COHEN (ed.), <i>Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici</i> ; BOIES PENROSE, <i>Urbane Travelers, 1691-1635</i> ; William Frost, <i>Fulke Greville's Caecilia</i> ; G. C. D. ODELL, <i>Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888)</i> ; S. B. WELLS (ed.), <i>A Comparison between the Two Stages</i> ; DONALD BUSH (ed.), <i>Selected Poems of Sir WILLIAM DAVENANT</i> ; LAND COOPER, <i>Experiments in Education</i> .	214
--	-----

<b>CORRESPONDENCE:</b> Noch Einmal: "Wee das Herz voll ist"; Worth Both His Ears.	221
---	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

HAZELTON SPENCER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

C. S. SINGLETON

KEMP MALONE

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00  
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries  
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB*, *JEGP*, *MLN*, *MLR*, *MP*, *NED*, *PMLA*, *PQ*, *RE*, *SP*, *RES*, *TLS*. Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

## DICTIONARIES AND GRAMMARS For 60 Languages

\*CATALOG FREE

SCHOENHOF BOOK COMPANY

(Established 1856)

HARVARD SQUARE,

CAMBRIDGE 38, MASS.

FIFTY YEARS OF MOLIERE STUDIES. A Bibliography, 1892-1941. By PAUL SAINTONGE and ROBERT WILSON CHRIST. Extra Volume XIX. 313 pages. \$3.50.

The most extensive bibliography of Molière is that of Desfeuilles, published as part of the Grands Ecrivains edition of the dramatist. It appeared in 1893, but included few items from 1892. MM. Saintonge and Christ have consequently begun their work with publications of 1892. They have brought it down to the end of 1941. Their volume constitutes an invaluable guide to students of Molière and of the theater in general, especially at a time like the present, when many aids to scholarship have ceased to be accessible.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

x  
see  
ot  
se  
of  
-  
=



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LIX

MARCH, 1944

Number 3

---

## ZUM PROBLEM DER NOVELLE BEI KLEIST

Die Bemühungen um die Form der Novelle in deutscher Sprache reichen bis nahe an die Anfänge der modernen Literaturepoche zurück. Experimentell und theoretisch haben deutsche Dichter sich mit ihr seit mehr als 150 Jahren auseinandergesetzt, aber nur in vereinzelten Fällen und dann beinahe zufällig haben sie die Anforderungen der Novelle auf ihre Weise und in ihrem Geiste erfüllt.

Die Novelle als Kunstform ist dem Deutschen wesensmäßig fremd. Weder in dem Leicht-fliessenden der romanischen "novella," noch in dem Pointierten der englischen "short-story" fühlt er sich zu hause. Er begnügt sich nicht gerne mit den Erscheinungsformen des Daseins, sondern verlangt von der Dichtung, dass sie hinter die Erscheinung vorstosse—and dieser Vorstoss ist notwendig der Todesstoss der Novelle.

Die Geschichte der Novelle in Deutschland ist daher vor allem eine Geschichte von Theorien und Experimenten. Dem deutschen Dichter ist die Novelle—mit ganz wenigen Ausnahmen—Problem geblieben, eine abgeleitete und immer wieder von neuem abzuleitende Kunstform. Vielleicht nur bei Goethe, Kleist, Keller und Storm wuchs sie organisch aus dem Gehalt und dem Wesen des zugrunde liegenden Erlebnisses, sei es biographischer oder ästhetischer Natur. So gibt es zwar eine Geschichte der deutschen Novelle, aber keine wirkliche deutsche Novellentradition.

Daher mag es kommen, dass das, was die deutsche Literatur an Novellen vorzuweisen hat, nie oder nur selten über nationale Würdigung gefunden hat. Selbst innerhalb der deutschen Literaturkritik ist das Misstrauen gegen die Novelle—and nicht nur gegen die Novelle sondern gegen jede Prosaform—weitverbreitet. Sogar dort, wo wirklich einzigartige prosaische Kunstgebilde vorliegen, besteht

eine Neigung sie zu diskreditieren und ihnen die Lyrik und vor allem das Drama als vollgültigere Formen vorzuziehen. Grillparzers Novellen standen so sehr im Schatten seiner Dramen, dass eine spätere Generation sie neu zu entdecken hatte. Nicht einmal Epiker wie Freytag und Storm haben sich von dieser Faszination durch das Drama freimachen können.<sup>1</sup>

Kleists Novellen machen darin keine Ausnahme. Auch in seinem Werk haben die Dramen die Novellen überschattet. Die weitverbreitete Tendenz, schreibt Hermann Davidts, in der dramatischen Dichtung eine künstlerisch wertvollere Ausdrucksform zu erblicken als in der epischen Prosadichtung, hat auch hier Schaden gestiftet.<sup>2</sup>

Wie weit sind die Gründe dafür in Kleists Novellen selbst zu suchen? Es ist verständlich, dass eine Kritik, die im Drama eine vollkommenere Form sieht als in der Prosa, die Novellen von den Dramen aus zu deuten und zu werten versucht. Kleists Werk musste dazu besonders einladen. Dass die Beziehungen zwischen dramatischer und epischer Kunstform bei ihm sehr eng sind, kann natürlich nicht geleugnet werden. Eine gewisse innere Bedingtheit der frühen Novellen durch dramatische Formprinzipien ist unverkennbar. Aber Davidts Hypothese, dass Kleists Entwicklung vom Drama zum Epos fortgeschritten sei, und dass seine Novellen das Mittelstück eines unterbrochenen Werdeganges darstellen, ist eine ungeheuerliche Verallgemeinerung, die noch dazu mit Davidts eigenen Ergebnissen nicht zusammenstimmt. Es ist sehr gewagt, bei Kleist von einer inneren Entwicklung zu sprechen. Auf jeden Fall lässt sich die Chronologie der Novellen nicht einfach durch den Grad ihrer Abhängigkeit von dramatischen Urformen bestimmen. Die Novellen, die am meisten einem dramatischen Aufbau nahekommen, sind *Die Verlobung von St. Domingo* und *Die Marquise von O . . .*, von denen die erstere ein Frühwerk ist und die letztere einige Jahre vor Kleists Tod geschrieben wurde. Das Entscheidende bleibt, dass die Novellen, und selbst die frühesten,

<sup>1</sup> Gustav Freytag: "Der Aufbau der Handlung wird in jedem Roman, in welchem der Stoff künstlerisch durchgearbeitet ist, mit dem Bau des Dramas grosse Ähnlichkeit haben." *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, 1887, S. 261.—Zu Storm vergl. seinen Brief an Keller in Köster's Ausgabe, S. 119 ff. —Selbst bei Jean Paul finden sich ähnliche Tendenzen; vergl. seine *Vorschule der Ästhetik*, § 70 und 71.

<sup>2</sup> Hermann Davidts, *Die novellistische Kunst Heinrich von Kleists*. Bonner Forschungen, Neue Folge, No. 5. Berlin 1913. (S. 7).

in sich geschlossen, selbständige und einmalig sind, und man ihnen ihre eigene dichterische Existenz nicht absprechen kann.

Ein Vergleich der Novellen mit den Dramen kann daher nur dann fruchtbar sein, wenn man das beiden Gemeinsame, den dichterischen Schaffensprozess in all seiner Mannigfaltigkeit, aufzuzeigen versucht, nicht aber solange in den Dramen nach Aufschlüssen und Quellen für die Novellen gesucht wird. Das was die Novellen mit den Dramen verbindet, ist nicht das Formale sondern das Temperament, der Lebensatem des Dichters. Als Gattungen sind sie zugleich objektiv und subjektiv—subjektiv in ihrer menschlichen Fundamentierung und objektiv in ihrer erzählerischen Kristallisation des Problems. Aber das ist bei den Dramen nicht anders. Es lässt sich kaum ein dichterisches Werk denken, bei dem die Begriffe "subjektiv" und "objektiv" so wenig besagen wie bei Kleist. Jeder Leser spürt unmittelbar das Persönliche und Intime, er glaubt in das Innerste und Privateste seines Lebens und Denkens zu schauen, und doch lässt sich aus seinen Dichtungen wenig Tatsächliches über den Menschen Kleist ablesen. Kleist enthüllt und verhüllt sich in gleichem Masse. Seine Dichtung war in jedem Augenblick Ausdruck und Auswuchs eines tiefen Dranges, eines Verlangens nach gestalteter Läuterung, nach Weltschöpfung, und als solches strebte sie ins Sichtbare, Objektive. Die verschiedenen Ausdrucksformen, wie Drama, Lyrik und Novelle, sind nur verschiedene Wege zu demselben Ziel, Konturlinien um dasselbe Zentrum. Selbst die Gelegenheitsdichtung steht nicht ausserhalb dieses geistigen Bannkreises.

Die Novellen sind deswegen den Dramen verwandt, aber sie sind keineswegs einfach Dramen in Prosaform. Es gilt hier sehr vorsichtig zu unterscheiden. Sie sind nicht dramatisch—oder sie müssen es jedenfalls nicht sein—aber sie sind tragisch. Es gibt in ihnen weniger Momente humoristischer Befreiung als in den Dramen, und der Humor führt nirgendwo zu einer Erlösung wie im *Zerbrochenen Krug*. Während der Dramatiker Kleist lachen kann, bringt es der Novellist nur zum Lächeln, einem mitleidigen Lächeln in der *Heiligen Cäcilie*, einem boshaften Lächeln in der *Marquise von O.* . . .

In Kleists Dichtung sucht man vergeblich nach Ruhepunkten. Nicht jedes Werk steht unter demselben atmosphärischen Druck, die seelische Intensität wechselt oft von Akt zu Akt und von

Kapitel zu Kapitel, aber eine wirklich unbeschwerde Stille findet sich nirgendwo. In den dramatischen oder novellistischen Ablauf sind Momente der Beruhigung und des Nachlassens verwoben, aber nur als Antithesen des Gefühls, als die Tiefpunkte des seelischen Auf- und-Abs, als Augenblicke notwendiger Sammlung. Völliges Vergessen bleibt unmöglich. Für das Idyll, unabhängig vom Schicksal und rein in sich beruhend, beschaulich oder resignierend, lebensfroh oder lebensmüde, gab es in Kleists Dichtung keinen Platz.

Trotz all dieser Beziehungen zum Drama stehen die Novellen als etwas Besonderes da. Dieses Eigene lässt sich nur an Hand ausführlicher Einzelanalysen aufzeigen, die den Rahmen der vorliegenden Arbeit durchaus sprengen würden. Einige allgemeinere Überlegungen müssen statt dessen genügen.

Schon Gundolf<sup>3</sup> hat darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass Kleist in seinen Dramen vom Menschen, in den Novellen aber vom Geschehnis ausgegangen sei, dass die Dramen von innen nach aussen, die Novellen aber von aussen nach innen fortschritten. Diese Scheidung ist zutreffend, aber sie reicht nicht aus, die Prosaform eindeutig von der Dramaform abzuheben. Sie genügt nicht, das Phänomen der Novelle bei Kleist zu erklären. Es gibt unter den Novellen einige, die mehr sind als die Abwicklung eines Geschehisses, in dem die Menschen sich nur als agierende Figuren bewegen. Und auf der anderen Seite leitet sich auch im Drama der Konflikt nicht immer rein aus dem Seelischen ab. Antonio Piachi (im *Findling*) steht unter einer ähnlichen Verknüpfung von Ereignissen wie die Familie Schroffenstein. Die Vorgänge und Vorfälle, die die Figuren im *Zweikampf* in ihre tragischen Verwicklungen stürzen, sind nicht "äusserlicher" als die Geschehnisse, die sich im *Zerbrochenen Krug* komisch abwickeln.

Ebenso wenig hilft uns Gundolfs Scheidung von "gemussten" und "gekonnten" Werken Kleists. Dass Kleist sich nicht in jedem seiner Werke mit gleicher Intensität gegeben hat, dass sein Wissen um künstlerische—dramatische wie epische—Technik sich nicht immer im selben Masse der Intuition bediente, lässt sich nicht abstreiten. Es mag sogar sein, dass die Novellen—wie Gundolf meint—ausschliesslich ein Produkt des Könnens und nicht des

<sup>3</sup> Friedrich Gundolf, *Heinrich von Kleist*, Berlin 1924 (besonders das Kapitel "Erzählungen," SS. 152 ff.).

Müssens gewesen sind. Aber das würde sie, als Kunstwerke, durchaus nicht von den Dramen abheben und sie etwa zu Dichtungen zweiten Ranges herabsetzen. Auch der *Zerbrochene Krug* und der *Amphitryon* verdanken ihr Entstehen ja weithin diesem artistischen Können. Überhaupt scheint es sehr fraglich, ob man das Können als solches dem Müssen unbedingt unterordnen darf. Das Vorurteil gegen das Handwerkliche ist ein sehr deutsches Vorurteil. Wo finge denn im *Käthchen von Heilbronn*—um nur bei Kleist zu bleiben—das Müssen an und wo hörte das Können auf? Und wer wollte uns sagen, ob das Können, dem der *Zerbrochene Krug* zu einem guten Teil seine Existenz verdankt, nicht nur eine Erscheinungsform des Müssens war?

Die Bedeutung der Novelle als Form—and damit der Unterschied zwischen Drama und Novelle—muss sich aus dem Formalen und dem Gehaltlichen zugleich ableiten lassen, wenn er uns überhaupt greifbar werden soll.

Ganz allgemein lässt sich zunächst folgende Feststellung machen: während die Stoffe der Novellen für eine dramatische Bearbeitung ungeeignet waren, ungeeignet aus mannigfältigen Gründen, lagen sie ihm, dem Drammatiker, doch so sehr am Herzen, dass er den Umweg ins Epische nicht scheute, solange er darin sein Eigenstes geben konnte. Die von ihm zu verwendende Prosaform hatte seinem dramatischen Temperament zu entsprechen. Er wählte die Novelle als eine Form, die mehr und andere Möglichkeiten bot als das Drama, wenn sie auch ihrem Aufbau nach dem Drama relativ verwandt war. Soweit man von einer Entwicklung in seinem Werk reden kann, scheint Kleist sich dieser Möglichkeiten in steigendem Masse bewusst geworden zu sein, obgleich er damit keineswegs eindeutig von der dramatischen Struktur fortstrebe. Er war von Anfang an Erzähler genug, seinen novellistischen Stoffen ungehindertes Wachstum zu gönnen.

Im Stofflichen unterscheiden sich die Novellen dabei zunächst weniger durch ihr verschiedenes spezifisches Gewicht als durch ein recht äusserliches Faktum, das sich als praktische Verwendbarkeit bezeichnen liesse. Denn dass die Novellen nur zufällige und abwegige Einzelstoffe behandelten, die sich beliebig von Kleist hätten vermehren lassen—with anderen Worten: "Berichte über ungeheuerliche Einzelfälle" wären (*Gundolf*), die an der Peripherie des Menschlichen lägen, kann nicht deutlich zurück-

gewiesen werden. Die gewählten Motive sind auch hier Erscheinungsformen des grossen Komplexes von Tod und Leben, Hass und Liebe, Humanität und Humanitätslosigkeit. Was sich in St. Domingo abspielt, ist nicht abwegiger als die Tragödie Penthesileas. Das Erdbeben, das die Menschenschicksale in scheinbar sinnloser Weise durcheinander wirft, macht das *Erdbeben von Chili* weder zu einer "Schauer-" noch zu einer "Wundergeschichte" (Gundolf), sondern stellt ganz elementar die befreiende und zugleich vernichtende Gewalt der Natur dar.

So viel wird jedenfalls deutlich: die Wahl der Novellenform ist bei Kleist nicht durch den grösseren subjektiven Gehalt des Stoffes bestimmt, wie dies etwa bei Grillparzer der Fall ist. Nicht das Ich des Dichters hat die Scheidelinien zwischen Drama und Prosa gezogen, sondern das Wissen des Dichters um das Gesetz der Form, um die dem Stoffe innenwohnende Ausdrucksmöglichkeit.

Ein Vergleich der dramatischen Qualitäten der verschiedenen Novellen und ihrer Stoffe kann uns noch einen Schritt näher an das Zentrum des Problems heranführen. Schon Max Lederer<sup>4</sup> ist in seiner Arbeit über die Dramatiker-Erzählung auf diese Weise zu wichtigen Ergebnissen gekommen, die sich in einigen Punkten mit denen Davidts' decken. Lederer hat seine Masstäbe wesentlich aus einer ausführlichen Untersuchung der *Marquise von O . . .* gewonnen. Seine Unterscheidung von dramatischen und epischen (Davidts: fatalistischen und charakterologischen) Dramatiker-Erzählungen, die eigentliche Aufgabe seiner Arbeit, lässt sich sicher nicht in jedem Einzelfalle halten, aber soweit es sich nur um Kleist handelt, gibt sie einen guten Ausgangspunkt ab. Zur Gruppe der dramatischen Novellen Kleists rechnet er lediglich *Die Marquise von O . . .* und die *Verlobung von St. Domingo*, während er den *Findling*, die *Heilige Cäcilie* und das *Erdbeben von Chili* als epische Dramatiker-Erzählungen bezeichnet. Abgesehen davon, dass er den *Michael Kohlhaas*, das *Bettelweib von Locarno* und den *Zweikampf* ohne weitere Begründung übergeht (und dies ist nicht die einzige und wichtigste Auslassung in seiner Arbeit!), können wir uns mit Lederer einverstanden erklären.

Die grössere Nähe der *Marquise von O . . .* und der *Verlobung von St. Domingo* zur dramatischen Form liegt auf der Hand und

<sup>4</sup> Max Lederer, Die Novelle des Dramatikers, *Neophilologus*, 5. Jahrgang, 1920, SS. 315-333.

ist, was die *Marquise von O . . .* betrifft, durch Ferdinand Bruckners Dramatisierung praktisch bewiesen worden. Aber auch die *Verlobung von St. Domingo* liesse sich in einem dramatischen Gefüge sehr wohl denken. Davidts weist darauf hin, dass diese Novelle sich "von allen anderen Novellen durch eine streng durchgeföhrte szenische Gliederung" auszeichne. Die Darstellung der Katastrophe würde allerdings ungleich grössere Anforderungen an den Bearbeiter stellen als die *Marquise von O . . .*. Rein technisch gesehen unterscheiden sich diese beiden Novellen von den anderen dadurch, dass in ihnen die dramatische Einheit des Raumes bewahrt bleibt oder sich doch leicht in einer dramatischen Umformung erreichen liesse. Das *Erdbeben von Chili*, das sich ebenfalls auf engstem Raume abspielt, ist dagegen aus dem Grunde als Dramenstoff unverwendbar, weil der Konflikt sich nicht zwischen einander entgegengesetzten Menschengruppen abspielt, sondern den Menschen in blindem Gegensatz zur absoluten Natur zeigt—oder anders gesagt: weil die Natur in tragender Rolle in die dramatisch-epischen Vorgänge eingefügt ist.

Lederer weist nun daraufhin, dass in der *Marquise von O . . .* der "heikle Gegenstand" einerseits und andererseits die Tatsache, dass "weniger die Charaktere als vielmehr die Ereignisse den Gegenstand der Handlung bilden," die dramatische Bearbeitung des Stoffes ausgeschlossen habe. Sein Argument unterscheidet sich von dem Gundolfs darin, dass für ihn das Gegenständliche nicht ein untergeordnetes Element bedeutet.

Dasselbe liesse sich auch von der *Verlobung von St. Domingo* sagen, nur dass hier das "Heikle" nicht darin besteht, dass der Dichter sich mit einer gewissen Ironie über das Tabu bürgerlicher Moralbegriffe hinwegsetzt, sondern in dem rein erotischen Charakter des dramatisch-epischen Konfliktes liegt. Dass der Konflikt mehr in die Ereignisse als in die Charaktere verlegt scheint, kann aber nicht als prinzipieller Einwand gegen die dramatische Natur des Stoffes genommen werden. Die Betonung des Stofflichen ist zum Teil durch die erzählende Darstellung selbst bedingt. Es handelt sich bei Kleist ja eigentlich nie um die Gestaltung des Menschen, sondern um das Sichtbarmachen der Kraft, die ihn bewegt. Während im Drama der Mensch der unmittelbare Träger dieser Kraft ist und als solcher deutlicher in den Vordergrund tritt, ist dem Novellisten dieser Umweg in die Charakterisierung zu

einem guten Massse erspart. Eine dramatische Gestaltung der beiden genannten Novellen würde den Konflikt in die Charaktere verlegen und aus ihnen ableiten. Auf der anderen Seite lassen sich die Ereignisse, die dem *Zerbrochenen Krug* oder dem *Käthchen von Heilbronn* zu Grunde liegen, ganz gewiss in einer novellistischen Bearbeitung denken, was, im Falle des *Zerbrochenen Krugs*, die Novelle Zschokkes beweist.

Es bleibt uns daher als Antwort auf unsere Frage nach dem Warum der dramatischen Novellen Kleists nur das, was Lederer als das "Heikle" des Gegenstandes bezeichnet hat. Heikel—wenn gleich in einem subjektiveren Sinne—sind aber auch z. B. die den Grillparzerschen Novellen zugrunde liegenden Motive. Doch während das, was bei Grillparzer nicht in die objektiv sichtbare Form des Dramas gekleidet werden konnte, dem intimen Erlebnisbereich des Dichters angehörte, handelt es sich bei Kleist um intime Erlebnismöglichkeiten des Menschen überhaupt. Selbst eine Novelle wie die *Verlobung von St. Domingo*, in der man eine "private Dichtung im höchsten Sinne des Wortes" (Davidts) gesehen hat, hat sich doch von ihrem Dichter in einem ganz anderen Grade objektiviert als eine der beiden Novellen Grillparzers.

In den "epischen" Novellen Kleists hat das Stoffliche allerdings eine dramatische Gestaltung von vornherein ausgeschlossen. Vielleicht könnte man im *Bettelweib von Locarno* noch am ehesten einen dramatisch verwendbaren Konflikt sehen, allerdings kaum in der anekdotischen Kürze, wie sie der Novelle eigen ist, die sich so sehr mit der Andeutung des dramatischen Gegenstandes begnügt, dass jede weitere Vermutung über den etwaigen Aufbau müssig bleibt. Der *Findling* und der *Michael Kohlhaas* dagegen sind geradezu biographisch angelegte Novellen, die zwar eine innerlich anschwellende Steigerung auf die Katastrophe hin besitzen, aber keinen dramatischen Aufbau. Eine entbundene Leidenschaft wird nur dann dramatisch gestaltbar, wenn sie auf eine ihr entgegengesetzte trifft, an der sie sich brechen kann. Wenn es eine greifbare, in ihrem Wollen einheitliche Gegenkraft nicht gibt, wenn der Held sich statt dessen mit dem Menschlichen, der Gesellschaft im allgemeinen und in all ihren Erscheinungsformen im Gegensatz findet, wie im *Michael Kohlhaas*, dann ist der Stoff trotz seiner dramatischen Schwingungen episch.

Vielleicht kann man Gundolfs Feststellung geradezu umkehren

und den Novellen Kleists grössere Weltweite zusprechen als seinen Dramen, in denen der Konflikt von Natur aus auf den engsten Raum beschränkt bleiben musste. Obgleich Kleist den Raum, in dem die Novellen spielen—und das trifft auf seine "dramatischen" wie auf seine "epischen" Novellen zu—nur mit ausserordentlicher Knappeit andeutet, findet sich in ihnen mehr reale Welt als in den "von innen nach aussen" lebenden Dramen. Die Landschaft, die in der *Familie Schroffenstein* abstrakt und unbestimmt ist, ist im *Michael Kohlhaas* national und lokal scharf umrissen.

Es kommt darauf an, das Eigene und Besondere der Kleistischen Novellenkunst deutlich zu erkennen. Der deutschen Literatur—von der deutschen Novelle ganz zu schweigen—wird wenig gedient, solange die Novelle als ein Nebenprodukt behandelt wird. Kleist hat vielleicht den entscheidenden Schritt zu einer deutschen Novelle von übernationalem Gepräge getan—obgleich er selbst so ausschliesslich deutsch war wie kaum ein anderer. Er hat einen Grundstein gelegt, den das 19. Jahrhundert verschüttet hat. Seine Novellen sind freier von einem beengenden "deutschen Milieu" und einer ausserhalb Deutschlands unverständlichen "deutschen Mentalität" als die Kellers und Storms. Seine Helden sind nicht nur "deutsche Menschen"—sondern sie sind Menschen.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

*The State University of Iowa*

### THE NINE HERBS

In the prose epilogue to the Old English "Nine Herbs Charm" the ingredients are enumerated as: *mugcwyrt, wegbrade þe eastan open sy, lombescyrse, attorlaðan, mageðan, netelan, wudusuræppel, fille and finul, ealde sapan.*<sup>1</sup> That, as everyone has thought, looks like nine herbs and some "old soap." But the scribe himself, in spite of an implicit confusion in his arithmetic, seems to understand

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. V. K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* (New York, 1942), pp. cxxxiii (Introduction), clxxviii (Bibliography), 119-121 (Text), 209-11 (Notes). The best edition, fully equipped. Consult also: J. Hoops, *Über die altenglischen Pflanzennamen* (Freiburg, 1889), pp. 55 ff.; H. Bradley, *Archiv*, CXII (1904), 144-5; F. P. Magoun, *Archiv*, CLXXI (1937), 29.

what every botanist would insist on, that apples are not herbs. For the instructions continue: *gewyrc ða wyrtæ to duste, mængc wip þa sapan and wip þæs æpples gor . . . sing þæt galdr on alcre þara wyrtæ, III ær he hy wyrce, and on þone æppel ealswa*, as if the *æppel* did not belong among the *wyrtæ* at all. When we dismiss the *wudusuræppel* from the list, however, only eight herbs remain upon it.

Even more annoying is the apparent discrepancy between this prose list and the catalogue of herbs in the poem itself. There can be no doubt that the magic number nine was intended to govern the reckoning (cf. lines 30, 32, 45); nevertheless, ten plant-names appear in the metrical parts of the charm. They are introduced in the following lines: *mucgyrt* 1, *una* 3, *wegbrade* 7, *stune* 14, *stiðe* 16, *attorlaðe* 21, *mægðe* 23, *wergræf* 27, *fille* and *finule* 36, the count being further disturbed by *æppel* in line 34. Commentators have tried in various ways to reduce the number from ten (or eleven) to nine, by saying, for example, that *una*, otherwise unknown, is but a synonym for *mucgyrt*, or that *stune* and *stiðe* are one and the same.<sup>2</sup>

Both of these suggestions, and indeed all interpretations hitherto offered for the poem, are ruled out by line 30: *Das VIII ongan wið nygon attrum.*<sup>3</sup> This means, I take it, that in the foregoing twenty-nine lines, the initial, main portion of the charm, nine herbs have already been designated. Preceded in the manuscript by a cross, the next line brings forward a new type of material and the verse moves away somewhat aimlessly. From the list above, however, it would seem as if only eight plants are named in lines 1-29, a defect as puzzling as that in the prose conclusion. But in each instance the difficulty may be overcome if we observe that the reference to *attorlaðe* has been deceptive—two different plants are called for. Notice lines 21-2:

Fleoh þu nu, attorlaðe;        seo læsse ða maran,  
    seo mare þa lessan,        oððæt him beigra bot sy.

If we now recognise a greater and a lesser “atterlothe,” and admit

<sup>2</sup> The verses for *stune* and *stiðe* are troublesome because of the pronoun *heo*, and the style is repetitious; hence the belief that only one plant is involved. For *una*, however, the textual distinction is clear enough.

<sup>3</sup> The uncertainty about the MS. *ongan* does not seriously hinder my assumption about this line. Holthausen's emendation to *magon* is splendid, cf. *Englische Studien*, LXIX (1934), 180-3.

that *una*, *stune*, and *stiðe* are distinct, the first division of the charm does contain nine herbs and becomes more intelligible. In turn, if we count *attorlaðan* twice in the prose list, leaving out *wudusuræppel*, that part makes sense too.

Do the nine herbs thus identified in the closing instructions match the nine in the opening section of the poem? Probably so. Several names are common to them both, and the other correspondences can be indirectly demonstrated.<sup>4</sup>

Let it be noted first that the four words which are hard for us to understand, *una*, *stune*, *stiðe*, and *wergrulu*, occurring nowhere else in Old English, are absent from the prose account; apparently in their stead, we find four easily understandable words, *lombescyrse*, *netelan*, *fille*, *finul*. It looks as if the commonplace had been deliberately substituted for the rare. Most scholars have seen this possibility, but the precise equations set up to resolve it further have not been convincing.

The misleading feature is this, that *fille* and *finul* occur also in the metrical part of the recipe. A special section, lines 36-44, marked off in the manuscript by crosses at beginning and end, is devoted to them.<sup>5</sup> It is likely, however, that they are substitutions here as well. The Christian elements suggest that this passage may be a tentative revision of antecedent verses, since the plants are spoken of in a way that connects them with *una* and *stune*. No one, I think, has sufficiently emphasised the following parallels:

Fille and finule	.....	
Stond heo wið wærce,	stunað heo wið attre,	41
seo mæg wið III	and wið XXX . . . .	
Una þu hattest,	yldost wyrta;	
þu miht wiþ III	and wið XXX . . . .	3
Stune hætte peos wyrt,	heo on stane geweoxt;	14
stand heo wið attre,	stunað heo wærce.	

Of course it is hard to say which plant goes with which, but the pairs coincide unmistakably. And in this event, the effort to asso-

<sup>4</sup> Heretofore, everyone has tried to make the prose list jibe with the whole of the metrical version. It has not worked, but the recurrence of *mugwyrt*, *wegbrade*, *attorlaðe*, and *mægðe* has been the subject of comment since Cockayne's day, cf. *Leechdoms*, III, 348.

<sup>5</sup> Dobbie omits these crosses, but see *Leechdoms*, III, 30-6. The divisions are noticeable in the context anyhow.

ciate *stune* with *lombescyrse* (so Hoops, Grendon, Dobbie) or with *netele* (so Magoun) can hardly succeed.

Although the remaining names from the verse, *stiðe* and *wergulu*, must therefore stand for "nettle" and "lamb's cress," the respective equations are again uncertain. The analogy of *stiðe* with the adjective *stið* "stiff," as Magoun pointed out, connects it semantically with the nettle. Both Hoops and Bradley support with their considerable authority the translation *wergulu* "nettle," but in arguing from the order of herbs in the two lists they adopted an enumeration that now seems unacceptable, mistaking *attorlaðe* for a single plant, and, in violation of elementary botany, calling the (*wudusur*)*aappel* an herb.

We are enabled, finally, to perceive the structural unity and distinctness of lines 1-29: this is, in a way, the "Nine Herbs Charm," and the rest may be excrescence.<sup>6</sup> The nine herbs are *mucgwyrt*, *una* (i. e. *fille*), *wegbrade*, *stune* (i. e. *finul*), *stiðe* (i. e. *netele*), *attorlaðe seo læsse*, *attorlaðe seo mare*, *mægðe*, and *wergulu* (i. e. *lombescyrse*). The function of the lines is plainly ritualistic. Preparatory to placing them in the mortar, the leech would pronounce over each herb, as he held it in his hand, the appropriate incantatory verses. Lacking the vigor of what has gone before it, however, line 30 reads more like a prosaic advertisement for the charm itself.

HOWARD MERONEY

*State Teachers College,  
Fredonia, New York*

---

#### SHAKESPEARE'S DOVE-HOUSE

Some years ago, when I was indulging my fancy concerning the possibly autobiographical quality of Shakespeare's talk about the earthquake and the dove-house in *Romeo and Juliet* I, iii ("Shakespeare Remembers his Youth in Stratford" in *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown*, 1940), I was not aware that a very superior dove-house existed in 1580 and is still to be seen at Wilm-

<sup>6</sup> Lines 1-29 have not seemed jumbled to anybody, but the incoherence of lines 30-63 prompted Wölker (*Grundriss*, p. 358) and Holthausen (*op. cit.*) to make wholesale rearrangements of the text. I suppose only that the scribe has ineptly pieced together several different charms.

cote, on or at least very close to the "Asbies" property which the poet's mother had inherited.

Mr. Oliver Baker's interesting book, *In Shakespeare's Warwickshire and the Unknown Years* (1937), reports the purchase (in 1929) and subsequent restoration by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trustees of "the very fine old house [at Wilmcote] which has been popularly known for many years as 'Mary Arden's Cottage,' an absurd name for what was not a cottage but a small manor-house. That it was a house of some importance is made clear by its size and the fine timbers that have been used in its construction, and also by the fact of its possessing a large stone pigeon-house" (p. 225). He goes on to say (p. 227):

An interesting feature of the Wilmcote farm is the ancient pigeon-house or dovecot. Shakespeare called them dove-houses. It has stone walls pierced with many nest-holes, which walls, as they were built only with local rubble, were, when bought by the Birthplace Trustees, bulging so much with age that it seemed dangerous to enter it. But Mr. William Weir, who is accustomed to repairing ancient and neglected buildings, said that he had saved many church towers that were much worse, and now after his treatment it is quite strong and likely to last for centuries.

"The pigeon-house at Wilmcote," Mr. Baker explains, is a rectangular edifice of limestone rubble, and was no doubt originally plastered. It has two gables of oak timbers, one facing the road and the other towards the farm. In the centre of the ridge is the usual louvre hole roofed over. The building measures twenty feet by seventeen externally, and inside is fifteen feet by twelve, so that walls are only two feet six inches thick, which may account for the dangerous state which it had reached when the Birthplace Trustees repaired it. . . . The presence of a large and ancient pigeon-house in the farmyard at Wilmcote is an interesting fact, as it seems to be evidence that the place was a manor-house; for nobody but a Lord of the Manor or a Rector was permitted to build one (p. 229).

This looks like unsolicited testimony in behalf of readers who get a sense of remembered incident rather than dramatic imagination out of this talk of "sitting in the sun under the dove-house wall" and "Shake!, quoth the dove-house." Apparently we can without rebuke assume that the boy was indeed sitting there—on a visit to his step-grandmother, Agnes Arden, who died the following December—when the earthquake of the afternoon of April 6, 1580 occurred; and it may be that the earthquake started the disrepair in the dove-house which Mr. Baker and the Stratford Trustees have had to set right.

TUCKER BROOKE

*Yale University*

## FALSTAFF'S CLOTHES

During a portion of the time allotted to Falstaff for mustering troops, Sir John, one of His Majesty's captains of infantry, showed great interest in securing fine clothes.

What said Master Dumbleton about the satin for my short cloak and my slops? [he asked his page] . . . I looked he should have sent me two-and-twenty yards of satin, as I am a knight . . . (*II Henry IV*, iv, ii).

When we consider that his men were "as ragged as Lazarus in the painted cloth" (*I Henry IV*, iv, ii), Falstaff's sartorial preoccupation seems almost criminal. Yet many Elizabethan captains showed a propensity for exquisite uniforms while their soldiers went almost bare.

This great difference between the dress of officers and that of their men was noticed and condemned by numerous critics of martial discipline in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Barnabe Riche, an army officer himself, felt in 1587 that it was

a president of some errorre, to see a Captayne that shall goe all to bee guilded, and to see hys poore Souldiours followe, with neyther Hose to theyr legges nor Shooes to their feete.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, Sir John Smythe, noting in his *Certain Discourses* (1590) that "all men of warre in times past haue had speciall care that their soldiers should be fitlie apparelled and armed," deplored the custom of modern officers

to suffer their soldiers to goe euill weaponed, and worse armed, and many of them without any kinde of armour at all, and in their apparell all to be tattered and torne, and some of them bare legged, or bare footed like roges: a thing never before heard off in any age, that men of warre, and chieflie the English nation, going to the aide of a forraine Nation, and the countrie and people wonderfull rich and plentifull in all abundance, and their Captainnes themselves verie gallant in apparel, and their purses full of gold; that their soldiers should be in such poore and miserable estate.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Barnabe Riche, *A Path-way to Military practise* (1587). As early as 1544, Peter Bethan wrote that a "captayne ought to be felowlyke in hys garmentes, wherby he shall purchase the fauour of the commons. And declare hys humbleness, auoydynge the name of arrogancie" (*The Preceptes of warre*).

<sup>2</sup> See the dedication, Sir John Smythe, *Certaine Discourses* (1590).

Matthew Sutcliffe, after several years spent observing the English army in his capacity of "Judge Martial" (i. e., advocate-general), came to the conclusion that military discipline would be greatly improved if "all men were resolued to bestow more in iron and steele, than in silkes and veluets and golden coates."<sup>3</sup>

Sir Thomas Digges, Muster-Master General under Leicester in the Low Countries, was incensed at the sight of the best leaders dressed in buff and the worst ones decked out in fine silks. Writing sometime before his death in 1595, Digges said:

the right valiant Captaine indeed, that (keeping his Band strong and compleat with armed souldiers, gaining nothing aboue his bare Wages, nor will extort vnhonestly vpon any Friend or Allie, and his wages (besides his meat and Armes) scarcely sufficient twice in a yeare to buy him a Sute of Buffe) Remayneth as a Man contemned and disgraced: Where the other by his Robberies and pickories can florish in Monethly Change of sutes of silke, dawbed with Embroderies of gold and siluer lace, and Iewels also: . . . That both abroad and at home also generally this picking lasciuious, carousing Freebooter shall bee called a braue man, a gallant souldier, yea Fit to bee a Collonell or great Commander that can drinke, and dice &c, with the proudest: When the true, valiant, honest, and right Martiall Captaine indeed is not able in such riotous Expences to keep port with others waiting Seruants.

But whether these silken, golden, embroydered delicate Captaines. . . . Or the other plaine leather, well armed, sober, painefull, valiant Captaines . . . shall doo their Prince or Countrey more honour at a day of Seruice?<sup>4</sup>

Robert Barret wrote in his *Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598) that a soldier "ought to be very moderate, and not ouer garish in his apparell and garments . . . he that is curious in his gate and attire, is neuer like to proue a perfect souldier,"<sup>5</sup> and two yeares later, Thomas Lord Buckhurst suggested "That no silks, nor silver nor gold lace, be worn in the field, in hose, doublets, cloaks, or gowns, except by the General, Colonels, and principal Governors only; but that all the bravery of the common Captains

<sup>3</sup> Matthew Sutcliffe, *The Practice, Proceedings, and Lawes of armes*, dedication to the Earl of Essex. Further in his book he writes: "Fronto published a decree . . . that men should [not] be defiled . . . with silken apparell. But now if gentlemen be not all beraied with silks, they think themselues defiled, & disgraced," p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Sir Thomas and Dudly Digges, *Foure Paradoxes* (1604), pp. 10-11.

<sup>5</sup> Robert Barret, *The Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598), p. 10.

and officers may be seen in their weapons and armour, and their apparel to be fustial canvas and cloth, and such like."<sup>6</sup>

This condemnation of gaudy military attire by men who were closely associated with soldiers in the latter years of Elizabeth's reign suggests that glittering silk-and-satin officers were both numerous and incompetent. Shakespeare's description of Falstaff as an army captain seeking satin for his uniform was undoubtedly panned with one eye on flesh-and-blood originals and was certainly meant to satirize these offenders.

HENRY J. WEBB

*Illinois Institute of Technology*

---

#### SHERIDAN'S "LITTLE BRONZE PLINY"

Since 1799, texts of *The School for Scandal* have usually given the climax of Crabtree's "circumstantial" account of the imaginary duel in approximately these words (v, ii) :

the ball struck against a little bronze Shakespeare that stood over the fireplace, grazed out of the window at a right angle, and wounded the postman, who was just coming to the door with a double letter from Northamptonshire.

However, in the best of the early versions, and in the very few modern texts based on them, the bust is "a little bronze Pliny."<sup>1</sup> According to the suggestion of R. Crompton Rhodes, "*Possibly Shakespeare was Sheridan's amendment.*"<sup>2</sup> But Sheridan was known for his extraordinary skill in improving his plays by revision; it was not characteristic of him to flatten out a jest in this fashion. It would seem probable that the explanation is to be found not in the preference of the playwright but in the audience for which he wrote.

Pliny was the classical letter-writer best known to the early eighteenth century, and he was widely regarded as a model of epistolary elegance. For example, Swift defended the comparative

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland (1599-1600)*, p. 379.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan* (ed. G. H. Nettleton and A. E. Case, Boston, 1939), p. 869.

<sup>3</sup> *The Plays & Poems of Sheridan* (New York, 1929), II, 101, note.

looseness of his own letter-writing on the ground that (unlike Pliny) he did not write for publication.<sup>3</sup> The editors of *The Tatler*<sup>4</sup> and *The Spectator*<sup>5</sup> assumed that their readers were interested in Pliny—and familiar with him. But in the latter part of the century allusions to Pliny were less frequent. It is unlikely that there were many busts of Pliny in the homes of private gentlemen, even in such oddly furnished libraries as that of Joseph Surface. It is equally unlikely that the name of Pliny would have been sure to suggest letter-writing to the throng of playgoers in the vast new Drury Lane Theatre.

It would seem that (whether by Sheridan, or by another skilful man of the theater) the sly reference to Pliny the letter-writer, from whose bust the bullet glanced against the postman bearing a double letter, was intentionally replaced by a pointless allusion to the more familiar Shakespeare.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

*Indiana University*

---

### MEREDITH'S *THE EGOIST* AS A PLAY

It is not generally known that George Meredith's *The Egoist* (1879) was made into a play by Alfred Sutro and the author in 1898.<sup>1</sup> Meredith's biographers do not mention the fact, and two of them, who knew that the dramatization of the novel was contemplated, were not aware that it had been made.<sup>2</sup>

The dramatic version of the novel was written, however, although it was never produced on the stage. Meredith records Mr. Sutro's first visit in a letter to Mrs. Walter Palmer, January 29, 1898:

<sup>1</sup> Swift's *Correspondence* (ed. F. Elrington Ball, London, 1914), iv, 126, 142; v, 251.

<sup>2</sup> Nos. 130, 149.

<sup>3</sup> Nos. 230, 484, 525, 554.

<sup>1</sup> Meredith's only other venture into dramatic composition was the unfinished comedy of manners *The Sentimentalists*, arranged for the stage by J. M. Barrie and presented in its incomplete form at the Duke of York's theater in 1910. See *The Works of George Meredith* (London, 1896-1911), XXXIV, 3-44.

<sup>2</sup> J. H. Hammerton, *George Meredith in Anecdote and Criticism* (London, 1909), p. 35. S. M. Ellis, *George Meredith, His Life and Friends in Relation to His Work* (London, 1920), p. 257.

A man named Sutro came here from Forbes Robertson some days back, with the proposal to dramatise *The Egoist*, as Forbes has taken to the notion of personating Sir Willoughby. It may be done. Sutro brings me the sketch of the Comedy shortly.<sup>3</sup>

It is probable that Meredith did not intend at first to do any of the writing himself. Sutro must have brought him a rough outline of the play for his approval and then, in late June or early July of the same year, a typescript of the complete play as he had written it. Meredith writes to Mrs. Seymour Trower on July 6, 1898: "if you fail to come we shall not meet, for I have to prepare *The Egoist* for the boards and can go nowhere."<sup>4</sup> Upon seeing the play as completed by Sutro, then, Meredith decided to take a hand in it himself and revise it completely. I have examined the manuscript, which is in the Altschul Collection in the Yale University Library, and its condition supports this conclusion. Miss Coolidge describes the manuscript as follows:

This manuscript contains 53 pages entirely in Meredith's hand. The remainder, which is typed, contains so many corrections and alterations in Meredith's own hand as to be virtually considered in autograph.<sup>5</sup>

Further evidence that Meredith did not at first intend to have a hand in the preparation of the play is found on the title page of the manuscript. The words "Arranged for the stage by Alfrēd Sutro" are typed, and just before Sutro's name the following words are written in, probably by Sutro himself, "George Meredith and."

The manuscript remained in the possession of Sutro until 1915, when he presented it in a sale for the benefit of the British Red Cross,<sup>6</sup> and in 1920 it was in the possession of Gabriel Wells.<sup>7</sup> Some time before it was presented to the Yale University Library

<sup>3</sup> *The Letters of George Meredith Collected and Edited by His Son* (New York, 1912), II, 492.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 496.

<sup>5</sup> Bertha Coolidge, *A Catalogue of the Altschul Collection of George Meredith in the Yale University Library* (Privately Published, 1931), p. 20. See also M. B. Forman, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of George Meredith* (Edinburgh, 1922), pp. 59 f. The manuscript contains 131 pages, many of which are typed pages marked out by Meredith; a few are blank but have been numbered for no apparent reason.

<sup>6</sup> M. B. Forman, *loc. cit.*

<sup>7</sup> See Clement Shorter's introduction to the printed edition of the play.

by Mr. Frank Altschul in 1931, it was owned by Mr. Jerome Kern, whose book plate is in it. In 1920, Clement Shorter, a friend of Meredith's in his later years, printed the play privately in an edition limited to thirty copies, the only edition that has ever been published.<sup>8</sup>

The play follows the outline of the novel very closely, whenever possible lifting the dialogue almost directly from the book; but the action is, of course, telescoped considerably so that each act contains incidents from many chapters. Act I opens with the arrival of the Middletons at Patterne Hall for a month's stay before the marriage of Clara and Sir Willoughby Patterne and covers in all the first ten chapters of the novel. Act II, condensing the next ten chapters, takes place at Vernon Whitford's wild-cherry tree and contains chiefly Clara's first effort to gain her freedom, which was frustrated by Sir Willoughby.

Act III, in two scenes, includes Clara's abortive flight and Sir Willoughby's proposal to Laetitia Dale, which gives Clara the hold over him that she needs. This act covers the next twenty chapters of the novel. Act IV builds up to the farce in which the characters are talking about different engagements without knowing it, condensing chapters forty-one through forty-seven. In the last act the lovers Clara and Vernon are united, and Laetitia accepts Sir Willoughby after he has been properly humbled.

On the whole, the play attempts to include too many of the incidents of the novel, and as a result many of the events seem to lose their meaning as illustrations of egoism; it is difficult to imagine that one could follow the action of the play without prior knowledge of the novel. Action in the dramatic sense is lacking, and the actors come and go as they are needed on or off the stage without regard for probability. Since Meredith's psychological analysis of character and motive has had to be cut out or inadequately rendered into dialogue, anyone who had not read *The Egoist* would get the impression from the play that the novel was simply a shallow and trivial story with an obvious, mechanical plot about a man whom he does not understand in the least. Sir Willoughby Patterne is

<sup>8</sup> The copy in the Yale Library is number ten, signed and numbered by Shorter. See Coolidge, *op. cit.*, pp. 120 f. Acts II and III, although correctly numbered, have been interchanged in the binding of the manuscript; the mistake has been augmented by misnumbering in the printed edition.

obviously an egoist—too obviously, for all the subtlety of Meredith's character study is lost. The paucity of the play graphically illustrates to what extent Meredith's novels depend upon his own intrusion into the story. That Meredith constructed his novels in scenes and conceived them in dramatic form is clear to any student of Meredith's works. As he says in a letter to G. P. Baker, July 22, 1887, "My method has been to prepare my readers for a crucial exhibition of the personae, and then to give the scene in the fullest of their blood and brain under stress of a fiery situation."<sup>9</sup> But Meredith never makes the meaning of the action clear on the surface because he is not interested primarily in the action itself, but in the characters and motives behind the action; and these he steps in to explain in his own person.

That the project of dramatizing *The Egoist* was conceived and carried out, however, illustrates a significant fact about Meredith's technique as a novelist: he tended to make the novel dramatic, to discard the protracted life story of an Oliver Twist or a Becky Sharp for a concentrated, unified presentation of character within the limits of a given situation. Such technique naturally suggested the drama.

RICHARD B. HUDSON

*Yale University*

---

#### A NEW WORDSWORTH LETTER

An unpublished Wordsworth letter, connecting the names of Johnson, Boswell, Reynolds, Beaumont, and Croker, was deposited in the University of Rochester Library several years ago by Howell L. Davies, Esq., of North Denbighshire, Wales. This letter is a companion-piece to a Wordsworth document in the R. B. Adam Collection.

The letter was written to John Wilson Croker on February 24, 1830:

<sup>9</sup> *Letters*, II, 398. The dramatist who influenced Meredith most was undoubtedly Molière, as can be seen from the many tributes he pays Molière in his *Essay on Comedy and the Uses of the Comic Spirit* (1877). It is significant to note that *The Egoist* was published about two and a half years after Meredith delivered his lecture on comedy, the only full-length novel published between those dates.

Dear Sir,

Having learned with pleasure that you are about to edit a new Edition of Boswell's Life of Johnson, I think the following Transcript from a blank page of my Copy of that Work may not be uninteresting to you. The words were dictated by the late Sir George Beaumont, and signed by him, in my presence.

I remain  
dear Sir

Very sincerely yours  
Wm Wordsworth

Rydal Mount  
near Ambleside  
Feby 24<sup>th</sup>  
1830

The companion-piece to this new letter is bound into an extra-illustrated volume of the *Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds* in the Adam Collection. It reads as follows:

Sir Joshua Reynolds told me at his Table, immediately after the publication of this Book, that every word in it might be depended upon as if given upon oath. Boswell was in the habit of bringing the proof sheets to his house previously to their being struck off; and if any of the company happened to have been present at the conversation recorded he requested him or them to correct any error—and not satisfied with this he would run over all London for the sake of verifying any single word that might be disputed.

G. H. Beaumont

Rydal Mount  
Sep<sup>r</sup> 12. 1826

This note by Sir George Beaumont was first printed by Croker in his edition of Boswell, published by John Murray in 1831 (Preface, I, x). The material was credited to Wordsworth, and Croker also spoke of "the late Sir George Beaumont, whose own accuracy was exemplary, and who lived very much in the society of Johnson's latter days." The note was also printed, from Mr. Adam's 1921 catalogue, by Mr. L. F. Powell in his revision of the Birkbeck Hill *Boswell* (I, 523); both versions differ slightly from the manuscript.

The new letter is without question in Wordsworth's handwriting, but the accompanying document was written by another. Examination of a sample of John Carter's handwriting in the Harvard College Library indicates that it was probably he who copied the material which Wordsworth sent to Croker. John Carter was long a servant and friend of the Wordsworths. He first came to them in 1813, as gardener and handyman. Version C of *The Prelude*

is in his hand, and he saw the poem through the press, probably under the supervision of Christopher Wordsworth.<sup>1</sup> Carter was an executor of the poet's will and died in January, 1863.<sup>2</sup> When Wordsworth wrote to Croker in 1830, his eyesight was poor and he often dictated his letters; his wife and his daughter usually served him in this office, but Carter may occasionally have helped. The attribution of the document to Carter is not certain; it may have been copied off by Dora Wordsworth.

Croker praised Boswell's diligence, but thought that Reynolds exaggerated. He did not, however, have access to the source materials. The original proof-sheets and revises of Boswell's great work are in the Adam Collection, and they show very clearly the great pains which the biographer took.<sup>3</sup> For example, Boswell wished to know the number of years Mr. Villette had served as Ordinary of Newgate. He sent a note to Villette and instructed the printers to open the answer; if this failed, they were to ask Mr. Akerman. "Get it somehow" was his final instruction.<sup>4</sup>

How Wordsworth first heard about Croker's new edition is not known, nor can the present location of the poet's copy of Boswell be traced. He may have read of the project, or may have heard of it through Robinson or some other literary friend. Croker had been at work on the edition since January, 1829; the work itself appeared a year after Wordsworth sent in his contribution.<sup>5</sup>

ROBERT F. METZDORF

*The University of Rochester*

<sup>1</sup> Ernest de Selincourt, ed. *The Prelude*. Oxford, 1928, pp. xviii, xx.

<sup>2</sup> E. J. Morley, ed. *Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle*. Oxford, 1927, II, 739, 842.

<sup>3</sup> See R. W. Chapman's article which was included in *Johnson and Boswell Revised* (Oxford, 1928).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 31.

<sup>5</sup> L. J. Jennings, ed. *The Croker Papers*. London, 1885, II, 24. I am indebted to L. N. Broughton, E. L. Griggs, and to Mrs. Evelyn M. Howe for help in attempting to identify the writer of the document in the Adam Collection.

RIME IN *PARADISE LOST*

A number of years ago there appeared a study of the rimes in *Paradise Lost*<sup>1</sup> which contained a number of errors, particularly of omission. The purpose of this note is to provide such emendation as is necessary. Professor Diekhoff examined, among other things, the number of couplets, the number of times riming lines occurred separated by one, two, and three unrimed lines. He found a total of 17 couplets, a total which is correct. However, he lists "sight-highth" (vi, 792-3) as a rime, though the spelling "highth" reveals, and our knowledge of 17th century pronunciation verifies, the fact that the word ends with a "th" not a "t" sound. But, if "sight-highth" is a rime, then D. should have added to his list "highth-might" (ii, 893-4). This would give him a total of 18 couplets. Furthermore, he missed the couplets of ix, 175-6, and x, 544-5, the addition of which should make his total 20. (Two of his listings, xi, 593-4, 666-7, are slips for lines 597-8 and 670-1 respectively.) However, the rime "eat-seat" (ix, 781-2) is probably only an eye-rime since "eat" was used in the past tense and often pronounced "ēt" from the 17th century on. Certainly "she eat" is past tense in the passage from which the phrase is taken: "So saying . . . / she pluck'd, she eat"<sup>2</sup>. Dropping out this and the "highth" rimes will leave the total of couplets in *Paradise Lost* still 17.

In his other listings Mr. Diekhoff reports that he found 45 instances where two lines which rimed were separated by one line which did not.<sup>3</sup> Actually the number is 56, for the following were overlooked: ii, 29-31; iv, 482-4; v, 350-2, and 857-9; vii, 452-4; viii, 171-3;<sup>4</sup> ix, 228-30 and 976-8; x, 59-61, and 144-6; and xi, 44-6, and 637-9.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Rime in *Paradise Lost*," by John S. Diekhoff, *PMLA*, xli (1934), 539-43.

<sup>2</sup> Further evidence in support of this inference is found in *Paradise Regained*, i, 352, and *Psalm LXXX*, line 22.

<sup>3</sup> He lists lines 189-91 instead of 190-2 of Bk. ii. But this is a "highth-might" coupling, and is no rime. His total should then be 44.

<sup>4</sup> If D. does not consider "Paradise-wise" a rime, he should not have listed "Paradise-flies" of Bk. v, 274-5 as one.

<sup>5</sup> D. lists lines 742-4 of Bk. xi as lines 736-8.

D's third classification is of riming lines separated by two lines not riming. His total is 52, but I find the number to be 72. The following instances have been overlooked: i, 503-6, 553-6 (584-7 are listed by D. as 582-7); ii, 435-8, (514-7 are probably a rime); iv, 593-6, 729-32, 825-8; v, 715-18, 797-800, 844-7; <sup>6</sup> vi, 182-5, 530-3,<sup>7</sup> 610-4, 658-61; vii, 251-4, 562-5; viii, 399-402; ix, 321-4, 720-3, 804-7, 1101-4; x, 712-5, 934-7.

In his fourth category—two riming lines separated by three lines not riming—my figures differ a good deal from D's. He says the total is 27; I find 51. Since D. does not list his findings, I append all of mine.

i, 183-7, 193-7, 425-9, 582-6; ii, 113-7, 230-4, 278-32, 320-4, 328-32, 444-8, 622-6, 685-9, 858-62, 950-4, 954-8, 1002-6, 1005-9; iii, 51-55, 129-33, 559-63, 676-80; iv, 115-9, 368-72; v, 62-6, 76-80, 901-5; vi, 187-91, 349-53; vii, 490-4, 556-60; viii, 37-41, 128-32, 475-9; ix, 45-9, 138-42, 310-14, 635-9, 702-6, 907-11, 1068-72, 1094-8; x, 198-202, 548-52 921-5, 937-41; xi, 6-10, 154-8, 449-53, 568-72; xii, 362-6, 551-5.

J. M. PURCELL

*Marquette University*

---

#### SHELLEY'S FIRST PUBLISHED REVIEW OF MANDEVILLE

Shelley's long review of *Mandeville*, by William Godwin, was published in *The Examiner* on 28 December, 1817. A short review of this novel which appeared in *The Morning Chronicle*, 9 December, 1817, has hitherto escaped notice, although Shelley made reference to it in a letter.

On 1 December Shelley wrote to William Godwin: "Mandeville has arrived this evening. Mary is now reading it—and I am like a man on the brink of a precipice. . . ." By 7 December, Shelley had read *Mandeville*; he wrote Godwin, praising the book highly. Godwin cut this laudatory paragraph from Shelley's letter, changed the references to himself from the second to the third person, and

<sup>6</sup> D. lists v, 794-7 "assume-introduce" and 841-4 "obscur'd-done." These are, of course, slips of the eye or pen, probably for the two examples I give.

<sup>7</sup> "groan-grown" are as much a rime as "right-upright," lines 624-7, which D. lists; "fight-highth" of lines 296-300 are not a rime.

sent this excerpt to *The Morning Chronicle*, where it appeared on 9 December, under the heading, "Extract of a Letter from Oxfordshire." Shelley saw the paragraph in print and wrote Godwin on the 11th:

If I had believed it possible you should send any part of my letter to the *Chronicle*, I should have expressed more fully my sentiments of *Mandeville*, and of the author. . . . The effect of your favourable consideration . . . has emboldened me to write—not a volume but a more copious statement of my feelings as they were excited by *Mandeville*. This I have sent to the Examiner.

ADALINE E. GLASHEEN

*Wheaton College*

---

#### A NOTE ON ARNOLD'S "CIVILISATION IN THE UNITED STATES"

In his essay "Civilisation in the United States" Matthew Arnold comments strongly upon an American volume "entitled *Our Country*" and quotes from it strikingly. The book<sup>1</sup> is *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York, copyright 1885). The title-page indicates it as "By Rev. Josiah Strong, Pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Cincinnati, O. With an Introduction by Professor Austin Phelps, D. D." Then comes this quotation from Emerson: "We live in a new and exceptional age. America is another name for Opportunity. Our whole history appears like a last effort of the Divine Providence in behalf of the human race." Strong wrote numerous passages that may be properly characterized in Arnold's words, used earlier in his essay, as "tall talk and self-glorification." The Introduction by Dr. Phelps is eulogistic, and urges serious consideration of the facts presented in the book, and immediate action of the sort proposed in it. Phelps ends his remarks (p. vii) by declaring: "The principles of such a strategic wisdom should lead us to look on these United States as first and foremost the chosen seat of enterprise for the world's conversion. Forecasting the future of Christianity, as statesmen forecast the destiny of nations, we must believe that

<sup>1</sup> For specified reasons, I previously thought the book "apparently" *Our Country: or, The American Parlor Keepsake*—see *English Prose of the Victorian Era*, ed. C. F. Harrold and W. D. Templeman (1938), p. 1298, n. 23.

it will be what the future of this country is to be. As goes America, so goes the world, in all that is vital to its moral welfare. . . ." Such information, and more that might be cited, give a good deal of justification for Arnold's attitude toward the book. Arnold has quoted verbatim from pp. 168 and 169, and his paraphrased or condensed passages on pp. 169 and 170.

Arnold carries his ridicule too far, however; and he weakens his attack on the book and on civilization in the United States when he misinterprets the meaning of *nervous*. Josiah Strong asserted: "Our national genius is Anglo-Saxon, but not English, its distinctive type is the result of a finer nervous organization, which is certainly being developed in this country." He followed this immediately by a quotation from "'Beard's American Nervousness,' p. 287":

The history of the world's progress from savagery to barbarism, from barbarism to civilization, and, in civilization, from the lower degrees toward the higher, is the history of increase in average longevity, corresponding to, and accompanied by, increase of nervousness. Mankind has grown to be at once more delicate and more enduring, more sensitive to weariness and yet more patient of toil, impossibly, but capable of bearing powerful irritation; we are woven of finer fiber, which, though apparently frail, yet outlasts the coarser, as rich and costly garments oftentimes wear better than those of rougher workmanship.

Strong, making use of Beard, proceeded thus: "The roots of civilization are the nerves; and other things being equal, the finest nervous organization will produce the highest civilization." It is this that Arnold leaps upon. But he leaps upon it with the weight of an unjustified interpretation; and hence with a false statement:

Undoubtedly the Americans are highly nervous, both the men and the women. A great Paris physician says that he notes a distinct new form of nervous disease, produced in American women by worry about servants. But this nervousness, developed in the race out there by worry, overwork, want of exercise, injudicious diet, and a most trying climate—this morbid nervousness our friends ticket as the fine susceptibility of genius, and cite it as a proof of their distinction, of their superior capacity for civilisation!

Unhappily for Arnold's point, it is *not* the "morbid" type of nervousness that his "friends" Beard and Strong and Colonel Higginson were talking about.

WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN

*University of Illinois*

REGARDING THE PREFIX *ý-* IN OLD NORSE  
*ý-miss*, 'VICISSIM'

All the standard ON grammars derive the *ý-* in *ý-miss* from the negative prefix *\*ū-* with *i*-umlaut (PGmc *\*un-missaz* > PN *\*ū-missaR* > *\*ū-missR* > *ý-miss*). Falk-Torp,<sup>1</sup> however, derive the *ý-* from the adverbial particle *i*-(<*\*in-*) with labialization > *ý-* when an *u* of the end syllable followed, as in *\*imsum* > *ýmsum*, dat. plur. form; the *i*- then being leveled out throughout the paradigm in favor of *ý*: "Wahrscheinlich ist *ýmiss* aus *immiss* (so vereinzelt in anord. sowie in norw. dial.) in formen wie *ýmsum* entstanden, wo *m* und *u* zusammenwirkten. Das adj. scheint von einer Verbindung *i miss* gebildet (vgl. lat. *invicem*)."<sup>2</sup> There are two serious objections to this derivation: (1) There are no parallels for the leveling of *i* to *ý* in an adjectival paradigm (cf. *ills* : *illu(m)*, where the original *i* remained unaffected by labialization throughout the paradigm in spite of the combined influence of *l* and *u*), and (2) the rare forms<sup>3</sup> with *i*- (cf. *i-miss*, etc.) instead of *ý*- can easily be explained as due to delabialization<sup>4</sup> of short *y* (cf. *ýmsir* > *ymsir* > *imsir*<sup>5</sup>, etc.). On the other hand, if the *ý-* in *ý-miss* is due to *i*-umlaut of *\*ū*-(<*\*un-*), how is this anomalous appearance of the *i*-umlaut of the negative prefix *\*ū-* to be explained (cf. *ú-likr* without *i*-umlaut)? To explain this anomaly we must first of all determine just exactly what force the negative prefix *\*ū-* had in the compound *\*ū-miss*.

Since the negative prefix *ú-* otherwise never suffered *i*-umlaut the suspicion is justified that the *i*-umlaut of *\*ū-* in *ý-miss* was due to the anomalous force of the prefix in this particular word. The normal usage of the negative prefix *ú-(ó-)* is to negate the positive sense of the element to which it is attached (cf. *ú-füss* 'not eager,' etc.). That the negative prefix *\*ū-* in *\*ū-miss* did not have this force is obvious from the fact that *ý-miss* does not mean

<sup>1</sup> Norw.-Dän. *Etym. Wtb.*, p. 1408, sub *Ymse*; cf. also Sigmund Feist, *Etym. Wtb. der got. Sprache*<sup>6</sup>, p. 363a, sub *missō*. Feist derives ON *ýmiss* from *\*i-miss*, but does not explain how an original *\*i* here became *ý*; so likewise August Fick, *Vergl. Wtb. der indo-germanischen Sprachen*, p. 321: ". . . an. *ýmiss* (aus *i-miss*) abwechselnd."

<sup>2</sup> I find no examples of forms with *i*, contrary to Falk-Torp (*ibid.*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Noreen, *Altisl. Grammatik*<sup>7</sup>, § 114.

'not alternate,' but still retains the positive force of the second element *-miss* 'alternate' (cf. Goth. *missō* 'alternately'). It follows then that if \*ū- had not suffered *i*-umlaut, a form \*ū-*miss* would have signified just the opposite of what the word means, viz., 'not alternate.' The simplex *-miss* signified 'now one, now the other,' which idea may be viewed from a negative standpoint, viz., 'neither this nor that, but now one and now the other.' Negative particles often imply a distributive, indefinite force (cf. the particle Goth. *-hun* = -*gi* : -*ki*, originally negative with indefinite implication; cf. Goth. *ni manna-hun* 'no one whatsoever': ON *man-gi* 'no one,' but *hvat-ki* 'anything whatsoever' = Eng. 'whatnot'). Evidently then we have in *ý-miss* an example of the negative prefix \*ū- in this indefinite function as a double negative re-enforcing the negative implication in the simplex *-miss*. Since the prefix \*ū- in no wise altered<sup>4</sup> the sense of the simplex *-miss*, it was no longer felt as a negative prefix (as in *ú-füss*) but as an integral part of the compound and thus regularly suffered *i*-umlaut > *ý*. On the other hand, the *ú*- in the type *ú-likr* preserved its negative force and therefore escaped the influence of *i*-umlaut in conformity with those compounds in which the *ú*- was phonetically correct (cf. *ú-füss* : *ú-likr*). Such a leveling could not apply in the case of *ý-miss*, since the original \*ū- here had lost its negative force and therefore was no longer associated with the negative prefix.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

*University of Kansas*

*HYMSELVEN LIK A PILGRYM TO DESGISE:  
TROILUS, V, 1577*

And ofte tyme he was in purpos grete  
Hymselfen like a pilgrym to desgise,  
to seen hire . . .

To visit the Greek camp disguised as a pilgrim in order to see

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of this negative particle compare George K. Anderson, "bis-Compounds in Gothic," *JEGPh.*, Vol. xxxv (1936), p. 36 ff.

<sup>5</sup> For the negative force of *-miss* compare its usage as the first member of a compound, as in *mis-likr* (Goth. *missa-leiks*) 'unlike, different' = *ú-likr* 'not like.'

Criseyde is but one of a number of unexecuted plans entertained by Troilus at one time or another in the course of the fifth book of Chaucer's romantic epic tragedy. Most readers have, I suspect, like myself read this glaringly anachronistic passage<sup>1</sup> with little more than a passing smile of condescension, for to talk about pilgrims in Troy is much like labelling the Greek seer Amphiaraus ('Αμφιάραος) a "bishop." (*Troil.*, II, 104.)<sup>2</sup> Both points betray the medieval man's egregious ignorance of Classical archaeology and Classical everyday life!

A pilgrim disguise is, to be sure, in terms of Trojan life a gross anachronism, but in introducing it at this point in his narrative Chaucer is guilty less of a whimsical invention than of being a follower or echoer of a well established migratory motif,<sup>3</sup> which happened to fit reasonably well into the frame of his narrative. The basis of this popular motif rests on an obvious reality described by Joseph Hall: "As minstrels, palmers and beggars moved about freely and without question, men wishing to disguise themselves usually adopted the dress of these classes."<sup>4</sup> Hall then proceeds to adduce a number of examples from ME romance and balladry, though he has overlooked the present conspicuous instance in the *Troilus*. Pilgrim disguise, adopted in order to find one's beloved, as projected at least by Troilus, is common also in French<sup>5</sup> and German<sup>6</sup> metrical romances. That this motif of pilgrim disguise as used by Chaucer and other ME writers may have had its origin or gained special momentum on the Continent rather than in England is suggested, if nothing more, by the history of the earliest instance in ME, namely, in Lawman's *Brut* (ll. 30730, 36 ff.).

<sup>1</sup> Not in Boccaccio and not commented on by Skeat, Root, or Robinson.

<sup>2</sup> The passage is adapted from Statius's *Thebais*, vii, 816-23.

<sup>3</sup> See Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, iv (Bloomington, Ind., 1934), 499, § K 2357.2; cp. K 1817.2 to which I am indebted for most references that follow.

<sup>4</sup> *King Horn: A Middle English Romance* (Oxford, 1901), p. 154, n. to l. 1052. This is the major MS. reference to this motif and should replace "Wells 9" of Stith Thompson.

<sup>5</sup> Christian Boje, *Ueber d. altfranzös. Roman v. Beuve de Hamton* ("Beihefte z. Zs. f. roman. Philol.", XIX, Halle, 1909), p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> J. Thien, *Uebereinstimmende u. verwandte Motive in den deutsch. Spielmännsepen*, etc. (prog. Hamburg, 1882), pp. 16-17. For a good modern instance cp. Melchthal's "Ich war verkleidet dort in Pilgerstracht," Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, l. 1062.

The passage in question rests ultimately on Geoffrey of Monmouth, near the end of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* (bk. XII, cap. 7, *ad init.*), where we are told that Brianus, after landing in Southampton (*Portus Hamonis*), exchanges clothes with a beggar (*pauper*) before proceeding to York in search of his sister.<sup>7</sup> For Geoffrey's beggar Wace in his poem substitutes "*pélerin*" (l. 14698, ed. La Roux de Lincy) and in this is followed by Lawman; the Welsh translation likewise has "pilgrim" here (see Griscom, *loc. cit.*).

At all events it is clear that in the Troilus passage we have to do rather with a migratory motif familiar to medieval readers than with any casual invention of Chaucer.

FRANCIS P. MAGOUN, JR.

*Harvard University*

---

### CHAUCER'S EIGHT YEARS' SICKNESS

Dr. Marshall W. Stearns, in his "Note on Chaucer's Attitude toward Love" (*Speculum*, XVII, 570-74), has much to say that is perspicacious and well-grounded on the general subject, though perhaps some comment should have been offered on Gower's testimony<sup>1</sup> that

. . . in the floures of his [Chaucer's] youthe  
In sondri wise, as he wel couthe,  
Of ditees and of songes glade,  
The whiche he for mi [Venus's] sake made,  
The lond fulfuld is overal.

As he himself realizes, Dr. Stearns is treading on more dangerous ground in proposing that Chaucer's reference in the *Book of the Duchess* to "a sickness that I have suffered this eight year" has autobiographic value. A. W. Ward, Ten Brink, Furnivall, and Dr. Galway, all scholars of standing, have concurred in this opinion, though their specific interpretations have differed.<sup>2</sup> What, I take it, has impressed even those who recognized the conventionality and

<sup>7</sup> Ed. Acton Griscom (New York, 1929), p. 522, l. 5; ed. Edmond Faral, *Les légendes arthuriennes*, III (Paris, 1929), 293, ch. 196, l. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Gower, *Complete Works*, ed. G. C. Macaulay (Oxford, 1901), III, 466.

<sup>2</sup> A. W. Ward, *Life of Chaucer* (London, 1879), p. 53. B. Ten Brink, *History of English Literature*, trans. W. C. Robinson (New York, 1893), II, i, 45 ff. F. J. Furnivall, *Trial-Forewords* (London, 1871), p. 35. *MLR*, XXXIII (1938), 1764.

the second-hand nature of much in the poem is the precise duration, eight years, assigned to the malady. I was myself impressed, and considered it the strongest argument for Dr. Galway's identification of Chaucer's sovereign lady with Princess Joan of Kent, who married the Black Prince eight years before the death of Duchess Blanche. Why would Chaucer have specified eight years unless he had actually been an unrequited lover, or played the conventional part of one, for that space of time?

An hitherto unnoted fact has, however, convinced me that the eight years are just one more of the poet's obligations to his French models. In the *Jugement du Roi de Behaigne*, composed by Machaut before 1346, the poet overhears a lady confess the love-lorn state of her heart to a knight in the following verses.<sup>3</sup>

Sire, il a bien set ans ou huit entiers,  
Que mes cuers a esté sers et rentiers  
A Bonne Amour, si qu'apris ses sentiers  
Ay très m'enfance,  
Car dès premiers que j'eus sa congoissance  
Cuer, corps, pooir, vie, avoir et puissance  
Et quanqu'il fu de moy, mis par plaisirance  
En son servage. . . .

Here, then, Chaucer might have got his notion of eight years as a specific time for the service of love. And if Chaucer were to borrow the notion at all, there was no more likely place. For as Kittredge demonstrated, the *Book of the Duchess* is a mosaic of lines derived largely from this very poem of Machaut's.<sup>4</sup> Legouis remarked:<sup>5</sup> "French poets are often put under contribution, even where the elegy seems most personal." The exquisite description of the Lady White, which one would expect to contain some details of form and feature peculiar to the dead Duchess Blanche, is an artistic translation, but still a translation, of the portrait of the knight's lady in the *Jugement du Roi de Behaigne*.

Moreover, the very passage quoted from Machaut above is among those Chaucer took and expanded.<sup>6</sup>

"Syr," quod he, "sith first I kouthe  
Have any maner wyt fro youthe,

<sup>3</sup> Machaut, *Oeuvres*, ed. E. Hoepffner (Paris, 1908), I, 62.

<sup>4</sup> *PMLA*, XXX (1915), 1 ff. *MP*, VII, 465 ff.

<sup>5</sup> E. Legouis, *Geoffrey Chaucer*, trans. L. Lailavoix (London, 1913), p. 79. <sup>6</sup> *BD*, vss. 759-69.

Or kyndely understandyng  
 To comprehend, in any thyng,  
 What love was, in myn owne wyt,  
 Dredeles, I have ever yit  
 Be tributarye and yiven rente  
 To Love, hooly with good entente,  
 And throghe plesaunce become his thral  
 With good wille, body, hert, and al.  
 Al this putte I in his servage. . . ."

In these lines there is every thought and even some of the very words of Machaut. Only the reference to seven or eight years is missing. Can we doubt that this is because Chaucer had already used it in reference to his hopeless malady?

Any biographic construction based on the duration of the poet's love-sickness must therefore be abandoned, and with it goes, I fear, the one solid prop for Dr. Galway's elaborate and ingenious hypothesis of a decorous romance between Chaucer and the Fair Maid of Kent.<sup>7</sup> We must return, however reluctantly, to the attitude of extreme skepticism adopted by Lounsbury and Sypherd<sup>8</sup> in regard to the eight years' love-sickness of the poet.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

*Columbia University*

---

<sup>7</sup> That the God of Love in *LGW* represents the Black Prince, returned from the grave, while Alceste is his widow, the Maid of Kent, seems most unlikely since Alceste was renowned for her fidelity to Admetus and could not therefore with any propriety be the widow of the God of Love. That the God of Love calls the daisy (*LGW*, F, vs. 321) "my relyke, digne and delytable," and that this is a reference to Alceste as his "relict" seems to be most hazardous since "relict" in the sense of widow is not recorded by the *NED* until 1545, and "relike," as Prof. Robinson pointed out (Cambridge ed., 1933, p. 957), occurs twice in the *Romaunt of the Rose* in the sense of treasure. The *Troilus* miniature, representing Chaucer reciting before the court, may very well depict the Princess Joan in the foreground, but this fact demonstrates no particular relation to the poet. Two remaining arguments, however, may have some value. It is curious that in the *Complaint to Pity* there should be reference to the "rial excellence" and the "regalye" of the personified virtue, for she, as the last stanza shows, is identified with the poet's lady. It is also curious that in the F version of the prolog of *LGW* widows faithful to the memory of their husbands are not mentioned together with clean maidens and true wives, but in the G version, written long after Joan's death, steadfast widows are twice mentioned in this connection (vss. 283, 295). This

THE ENGLISH PROSE TRANSLATION OF  
*LEGENDA AUREA*

In the prologue to his *Golden Legend*, Caxton declares that he has made his compilation from "a legend in French, another in Latin, and a third in English."<sup>1</sup> Of the English translation eight manuscripts survive, all copies, and all representing one version,<sup>2</sup> made before 1438. The colophon of Douce 372 reads: "And also here endith the lives of Seintis that is callid in Latynne Legenda aurea and in Englisshe the gilte legende, the whiche is drawen out of Frensshe into Englisshe, the yere of oure lorde a M. CCCC. and xxxvij; bi a synfull wretche . . . ."<sup>3</sup> This clear statement that the work was done by a single translator who used a French version of the *Legenda* is contradicted by the colophon of Harleian 630: "compiled and drawnen into englyssh bi worthi clerkes and doctours of Diuinite suengly aftre þe tenur of þe latin."<sup>4</sup> Comparison of the English with manuscripts and printed editions of the popular French version made before 1348 by the Hospitaller Jehan de Vignai leads Dr. Butler to believe that the translator depended on the French rather than on the original Latin, although some corrections may have been introduced from the latter.<sup>5</sup> Moreover the colophon of Douce 372 deserves special credence because it appears to be the composition of the translator himself, whereas the Harleian colophon was probably added by a scribe. It is of course possible that the work of translation was shared by several

change may be explained, as Miss Galway does, by the fact that the mention of steadfast widows might possibly have hurt the feelings of Joan, who had remarried after the death of her first husband.

<sup>1</sup> T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer* (New York, 1892), I, 210-24. *MLN*, XX (1905), 240-43.

<sup>2</sup> *The Golden Legend*, ed. F. S. Ellis, Temple Classics, 1931, I, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Harleian 4775, Harleian 630, Egerton 876, Lansdowne 350, Lambeth 72, B. M. Add. 11, 565, B. M. Add. 35, 298. See Pierce Butler, *Legenda Aurea, Légende Dorée, Golden Legend*, Baltimore, 1899, pp. 50, 147 ff. "The Ashburnham manuscript" is now B. M. Add. 35, 298. Several others, containing a few legends each, need not be mentioned here.

<sup>4</sup> F. Madan, *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, Oxford, IV, p. 610.

<sup>5</sup> Butler, p. 54.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 147.

persons, some of whom worked from the Latin, while others used the French intermediary, but the general character of the vocabulary points to a fairly consistent use of the French.

More than one critic has thought the English of this translation superior to that of Caxton's version. If the "synfulle wretche" had set his name to his work, he might now have an honored place among the writers of clean English praised by Mr. R. W. Chambers.<sup>6</sup> One conjecture as to his identity is inevitable. Osbern Bokenham, the Augustinian friar who made metrical translations of thirteen lives of women saints, writes in the first chapter of his *Mappula Angliae* (before 1445): "For as moche as in the englishe boke the whiche y haue compiled of legenda aurea and of oþer famous legendes . . . is oftene-tyme in lyvis of seytis, Of seyt Cedde, seyt Felix, seyt Edward, seyt Oswalde, and many oþer seytis of Englond . . ."<sup>7</sup> Many years ago Dr. Horstmann regretfully dismissed Bokenham's claim to the authorship of the extant English translation because the manuscripts known to him did not contain the four saints mentioned.<sup>8</sup> Later students of Bokenham have not, so far as I know, reconsidered the possibility in the light of manuscripts found after Horstmann's comment was made.<sup>9</sup> The fact is that three of those added by Dr. Butler to Horstmann's list contain some of the legends mentioned by Bokenham. S. Chad is in B. M. Add. 11, 565; SS. Chad, Oswald, and Edward, King and Martyr, are in Lambeth 72 and B. M. Add. 35, 298. The latter also contains S. Edward, King and Confessor. S. Felix (of East Anglia), the only saint mentioned by Bokenham and not found in these manuscripts, may actually be in one or more of them, unnoticed by cataloguers.<sup>10</sup> The original *Legenda* contained two saints of this name, and the addition or substitution of the English Felix might easily pass unmarked.

The chronology of Bokenham's life and writings would make this work, if it be his, a product of his early middle age. He was born

<sup>6</sup> "Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School" in *Harpsfield's Life of More*, EETS., 186, pp. xlvi-clxxiv.

<sup>7</sup> Edited by C. Horstmann from the unique MS., Harl. 4011 f., 144 ff., Eng. St., x, 188.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> G. H. Gerould, *Saints' Legends*, Boston, 1916, p. 190; Mary Serjeantson, *Bokenham's Legendys of Hooly Wummen*, EETS., 206 (1938), p. xviii.

<sup>10</sup> I am dependent on catalogues for descriptions of all manuscripts except Harleian 4775.

about 1393, and the translation was made before 1438, the date of Douce 372. In view of the fact that he declares that he translated the *Legenda Aurea* adding, among others, four English saints, and that three of these are found in three manuscripts of an English translation, the date of which harmonizes with the known dates of his life, it would seem reasonable to suppose that the East Anglian friar is the translator of the pre-Caxton Golden Legend. Intensive study of vocabulary and syntax may confirm or disprove this attribution. The purpose of this note is merely to point out that the decision against Bokenham's claim is based on a premise now invalidated by the contents of three manuscripts.

SISTER MARY JEREMY, O. P.

*Rosary College,  
River Forest, Illinois*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*The Legends of Ermaneric.* By CAROLINE BRADY. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1943. Pp. xii + 341. \$3.00.

This "completely rewritten" dissertation (p. vii) is an attempt to prove that the good Ermanric of legend derived from Ostrogothic tradition; the evil Ermanric, from the tradition of peoples subjugated by him. In the course of her argument the author surveys the references to Ermanric in history and story, and studies the legends about him in Ostrogothic Italy, West Scandinavia (Norway and Iceland), Denmark, England and Germany, devoting a chapter to each. In a final chapter she takes up the transmission of the legends and presents her conclusion. She adds a table of abbreviations, a bibliography, and an index. The book is well written and well printed.

If the author's hypothesis about the two Ermanrics had any factual basis, one would expect to find the good king celebrated in South Germany (which learned of him from the Ostrogoths of northern Italy); the evil king, in Scandinavia (to which had migrated a branch of the Eruli, one of the subject peoples). The contrary is the case, of course, and the hypothesis falls to the ground. We have no evidence that the Eruli or any other subject people made any contribution whatever to the tale of Ermanric. The earliest form of the legend, that of Jordanes, is Ostrogothic,

and presents Ermanric favorably, but not wholly so; the shady side of his character also comes out, and affords a sufficient basis for his development into the evil king of later story.

Ermanric's ruthless legalistic heathen justice quite naturally, in the course of time, came to be thought of as tyranny and cruelty. The OE poem *Deor* gives us the only literary record of this stage. In this as in other matters the poet's source of information was presumably North German, a point not mentioned in Miss Brady's discussion (p. 161). The next stage turns Ermanric into an unnatural slayer of his own kin, but saves his character (at the expense of his intelligence) by making him the dupe of an evil counselor. Miss Brady points out (p. 253) that this stage was known to the tenth century writer Flodoard, but she fails to note that Flodoard was merely reporting the exhortations of Fulco, a ninth-century worthy. Fulco in turn got his information *ex libris Teutonicis*, and such books are best dated from the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth, when Charlemagne interested himself in getting native story recorded, after the English missionaries had brought to the Continent the English habit of writing in the vernacular.

In all versions of this stage the evil counselor figures,<sup>1</sup> with a single exception: the annalistic notice of *circa* 1000, the so-called Annales version. According to H. Schneider, "der böse Rat . . . fehlt aber nur durch Zufall" even in the Annales (see *Germ. Heldenage*, I, 241), but since the annalist transfers the counselor's cunning to Ermanric himself his omission of the counselor was surely no accident. The annalist's representation of Ermanric as *astutior in dolo, largior in dono* is obviously a fusion product: the evil counselor contributed the cunning, his dupe the generosity. This characterization of Ermanric appears nowhere in story, and is to be taken as a personal construction of the annalist's; its neat rhetorical form is worthy of special note.

Miss Brady emphasizes the fact that in the South German monuments the evil counselor is superfluous, since Ermanric has become "the blackest of tyrants, capable of committing any nefarious deed" (p. 252). Since these monuments are all late, one would naturally conclude that the early conception of the king as dupe faded in the course of time, in South German story, with a consequent reduction in the importance of the evil counselor: the horrible deeds attributed to Ermanric ended, naturally enough, by making him as evil as they. In other words, the evil counselor, "inorganic" (*l. c.*) in late story, is a relic, there, of earlier story in which he was highly organic. But this is not Miss Brady's view. She thinks that the evil counselor of South German tradi-

<sup>1</sup> But *Hamðismál* and *Ragnarsdrápa* presuppose rather than tell the story of Randvér and Svanhildr and therefore make no mention of the evil counselor. Cf. Miss Brady's judicious comment, p. 54.

tion was borrowed from North German tradition (*l. c.*). She does not make it clear why the South German story-tellers would borrow a character they had no real use for. And elsewhere (pp. 230 f.) she argues that Sibicho was known as an evil character all over Germany as early as the middle of the ninth century. The early South German evil character Sibicho is obviously the proper source for the late South German evil character of the same name, and the theory of borrowing from the North is needless.

Miss Brady makes much (pp. 178 f., 222 f.) of the motivation found for the evil counselor's wicked course. But, as Schneider rightly observes (*op. cit.*, I, 240), "Die Begründung von Sibichs Verhalten ist novellistische Zutat ohne erkennbare Quelle, die Bosheit des Verräters bedarf an sich nicht der Motivierung." In the nature of the case the introduction of this trait involved a blackening of Ermanric's character. Presumably this blackening is not older than the trait of which it makes an integral part. Miss Brady is taking these untraditional elements too seriously when she argues (p. 179) that Ermanric "is fundamentally to blame" for what happens. In the traditional tale he is a dupe and the evil counselor gets the blame for his lord's misdeeds.

Limitations of space keep me from taking up many of the things in this book which need comment or correction. The author's discussion of *Widsith* 115 may serve to illustrate her methods. This line reads,

Seccan sohte ic ond Beccan, Seafolan ond Peodric.

Two kings famous in history and story bore the name *Peodric*: King Theodoric the Great, an Ostrogoth, and King Theodoric son of Clovis, a Frank. Presumably the poet here refers to one of them. Which one? The decision obviously depends on the identification of Seafola, with whom Peodric is paired. Miss Brady tells us that Jiriczek "made out a convincing case for identifying Seafola as the Sabene of the Wolfdielrich story" (p. 171).<sup>2</sup> If so, then Peodric is to be identified with Theodoric the Frank, for it is the Frank, not the Ostrogoth, who figures in the Wolfdielrich story. Yet elsewhere Miss Brady says that Seafola and Peodric "may be either Goths or Franks" (p. 155), and that "a decisive conclusion can never be reached" (p. 158). If by "decisive" Miss Brady means mathematically certain, she is right, but in the

<sup>2</sup> She adds, "the identification is by no means undisputed (cf., e.g., Chambers, *Wid.*, pp. 41 ff.)," but she fails to warn the unwary reader that Jiriczek's paper was written in criticism of Chambers' views as expressed in *Wid.*, pp. 41 ff., and that Chambers made no reply. His silence, if I am any judge (and I knew him well), means that he felt he had no case. And nobody else has written a reply to Jiriczek. His paper still stands, after nearly a quarter of a century, as the definitive treatment of the point. And such it bids fair to remain indefinitely. This question has been settled.

study of heroic legend we deal with probabilities only, and Jiriczek established the overwhelming probability that Seafola, and therefore Peodric, belong to some version of the Wolfdietrich story.

This granted, we may proceed further, since the chances are that the other two names in the line likewise belong to this story.<sup>3</sup> A major character in the Wolfdietrich story is the faithful retainer Berchtung, and the names *Berchtung* and *Becca* may legitimately be taken as variant short forms of one original: *viz.*, a full name containing the element *berht*.<sup>4</sup> What was this full name? Since Theodoric the Frank's son Theodberht played a historical part out of which Berchtung's legendary part might readily have grown, I took it that *Theodberht* was the full name to which the short forms *Berchtung* and *Becca* answer. Finally, I recognized in *Betto* another legitimate short form of *Theodberht*, with the usual hypocoristic assimilation: *rht* > *tt*. From *Betto*, by addition of the hypocoristic *k*-suffix, *Becca* is obviously derivable: *Bettca* > *Becca*. But *Becca* may as easily be derived from the full name *Theodberht*, by loss of the name-element *theod-* and addition of the *k*-suffix: *Berhtca* > *Becca*. Unable to choose between these two equally good derivations, I mentioned them both and let it go at that (*Englische Studien*, LXXIII, 182).

Miss Brady comments: "the suggestion that it [i. e., *Becca*] can be derived from either *Theodberht* or *Betto*, that 'it all comes to the same thing,' is enough to shake one's faith in the hypocoristic suffix" (p. 172). Such carping seems better suited to an election campaign than to a scientific investigation. Contributory (*l. c.*) to the shaking of Miss Brady's faith is the circumstance that, on p. 127 of my ed. of *Widsith*, I said, "the chances are that the full name of King Becca [of line 19] began with *berht*." Undoubtedly I ought to have said "began or ended" here. The scanty evidence collected in F. Stark's *Kosenamen der Germanen* indicates that hypocoristic names made with *berht* may go back to full names either beginning or ending in that element (five cases; ratio, 3:2). But I was not really concerned, in the passage quoted, with the position of the name-element. I was discussing Redin's suggestion that *Becca* was "a short form of compounds with *Beorn*, *Beorht*-

\* Miss Brady is more positive. She says, "It is within the line that we find the linking of names that is the clue to the story lying behind the allusion; there is, with few exceptions, no necessary connection between the heroes named in successive lines" (p. 155). This implies that there is a "necessary connection" between the heroes named in the same line. Here Miss Brady goes too far. In the Third Thula of *Widsith* such a connection may safely be reckoned likely (though by no means necessary) if conflicting evidence is wanting; in the First Thula we have no reason to presume any connection.

<sup>4</sup> Heusler in his famous paper, "Heldenamen in mehrfacher Lautgestalt" (*ZfdA* LII), established the fact of such variation in heroic legend, and everyday experience gives us familiar parallels: thus, from *Elizabeth* are derived the short forms *Beth*, *Betty*, *Betsy*, *Bessie*, *Bess*, etc.

. . ." and, in concluding that the chances favored *Beorht* rather than *Beorn*, I carelessly followed Redin's form of expression. The position of *berht* in the full name answering to *Becca* 19 cannot, in fact, be determined. Here we have no story to limit the linguistic possibilities, and *Becca* is therefore derivable from any name containing the element. In line 115, on the contrary, we are dealing with a story, and the linguistic possibilities are therefore severely limited: only such full names as occur in the legend itself or in its historical source-material can be connected with the hypocoristic forms here recorded by the *Widsith* poet. In this material we find only one name containing the element *berht*: that of King Theodoric's son Theodberht. The *Beccan* of *Widsith* 115 is therefore to be derived from *Theodberht*, or from the short form *Betto* of that full name. Miss Brady's further comments (*l. c.*) show inadequate understanding of problem and method of solution.

Much the same may be said of Miss Brady's comments on *Widsith* 5b (p. 170), 9a (p. 169), 18 (p. 149), 19 (p. 155), and 109-130 (Cap. iv, *passim*). Equally unfortunate is her attempt to read Óðinn into the *Hamðismál* (pp. 32-34) and even into the pages of Procopius (p. 92), ignoring the fact that *Martis dies* means Tuesday, not Wednesday. She unduly minimizes the injuries done to the text of the *Hamðismál* by the tooth of time; the damage is not "negligible" (p. 27) from any point of view. In the last syllable of the proper name *Hróðrglǫð* (*Hamðismál* 22), Miss Brady (p. 32) takes the *au* of the MS. to mean long *o*, an impossible reading: if long, the reading should be *au* (the diphthong); if short, *o*. The reading with *o* is regularly and rightly preferred; compare *Mengloð*. Whoever *Hróðrglǫð* may be, her sex makes it impossible to identify her with Óðinn.

I add a few miscellaneous items. According to Miss Brady (p. 163), the *Widsith* poet wrongly represents Ermanric as a Hreiðgoth. Ermanric is called *Hreðcyning* in line 7, and it is possible (though linguistically and stylistically difficult) to take this in the sense 'king of the Hræde,' but the title, so taken, is in perfect agreement with history if we accept the authority of Jordanes, who gives to Ermanric an empire stretching from Baltic to Euxine. Moreover, this title does not make Ermanric a tribesman of the Hræde, any more than the title 'King of England' made James I an Englishman.—The feud between Dane and Bard is not represented in the English monuments as "lasting over several generations" (p. 6); it is in Scandinavia, not in England, that the story is stretched to cover several generations.—The sword Hrunting is not represented in *Beowulf* as a weapon "of supernatural origin" (p. 72).

The faults of this book, and of Miss Brady's papers in the same field, are those of immaturity. The author has not yet lived with the old texts long enough, and does not yet know them intimately

enough. Moreover, her judgment has not yet been sharpened by long experience in research, and she overestimates the worth of debaters' points. On the other hand, she possesses valuable assets: wide reading, acquaintance with several languages, skill in composition, an independent mind, the courage to say what she thinks, willingness to work hard and long. One feels that she has in her the capacity for literary investigation, and that in due time she will produce work of permanent value.

KEMP MALONE

---

*Chaucer's Irregular -E. A Demonstration among Monosyllabic Nouns of the Exceptions to Grammatical and Metrical Harmony.* By RUTH BUCHANAN MCJIMSEY. New York: King's Crown Press, 1942. Pp. x + 248. \$2.00.

After having made an extensive investigation of Chaucer's use of *alms* in rhyme, together with "all the rhymes of each rhyme of each rhyme" (pp. 16-17), Miss McJimsey should have been forewarned ere she embarked upon such a complicated and difficult study as the present. The extent of the details involved, the intricacy of the problems presented, and the constant challenge to accuracy, must have called for a steadiness of control of the material such as few pieces of scholarly work may reasonably require. But students in the field will be ultimately much indebted to her patience and industry. She has taken full account of the results of earlier grammatical and metrical research, and yet she has gone over the evidence for herself in so far as it relates to monosyllabic nouns. The conclusions she has reached, of course, with a due consideration of scansion and rhyme, and her policy in this regard she has clearly stated. An example of her shrewd method may be quoted: ". . . whenever the pronunciation of an -e is not required to prevent a pause between two accented syllables, the present investigation considers no -e to exist in pronunciation unless some other evidence indicates than an -e should be pronounced. But as a matter of fact, this scansion evidence for the non-existence of -e is highly unsatisfactory. It is at best negative evidence" (p. 6). Again: ". . . the present study has worked on the basis that dissyllabic feet are normal in iambic verse and has kept a count of the cases in which -e is not metrically necessary. But with the possibility of trisyllabic feet admitted, it should now be clear why it is much easier to prove the pronunciation of an -e than to disprove it" (p. 7). "But if the scansion evidence is merely negative and the rhyme evidence is positive, then the negative evidence decreases in value . . ." (p. 12).

For convenient reference the conclusions of the study are offered in an epitome and again printed with full evidence in the pages that

follow, with a final summary of special points. The location of the lines is that of the Chaucer *Concordance*, which is based on the *Globe Chaucer* and convenient enough for most purposes except perhaps in the line-numbering of the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*. The occasional use of the reading of some lines according to Robinson's edition and allusion to his notes make this arrangement a little undesirable. One hesitates to suggest, however, that both locations might have been indicated. The derivation of the words is that of the New English Dictionary. A bibliography and an index of the nouns considered (but not of other matters nor of many other words cited as evidence) are furnished at the end.

As Miss McJimsey is the first to admit, much of what she has discovered was inevitably known and understood before, such as the fact that "Many monosyllabic nouns of [Old English] feminine origin have an inorganic final -e" (p. vii). But she also corroborates much that has been so far largely theoretical: for example, that "In some idiomatic expressions of measure -e is added to monosyllabic nouns without -e in general usage" (p. vii). Some points of special interest emerge, such as the fact that the Old English feminines *might* and *night* and certain others do not take an -e. In her summary we find also that because of the monosyllabic nouns which have a long vowel followed by a single consonant with a final unaccented -e, "final -e emerges as phonologically useful in indicating long stressed monosyllables" (p. 218) and thus, after it had survived only in writing, we may add, it so commended itself to printers for indicating a preceding long vowel. The last point offered in the book, namely that Chaucer's "language as revealed in his verse is to be cleared from the charge of archaism" (p. 219), may well be true but is somewhat dubious inasmuch as the evidence is all taken from literary sources—poetry at that.

It is no criticism of the present study to say that it raises many questions that it cannot answer. For instance, when it sets forth the principle that in rhyme "unless at least one word involved has established an independent claim through scansion to a pronounced -e, rhyme merely proves that words so grouped are alike with regard to -e . . ." (p. 12), it does not tell us clearly whether one word which has a claim to -e and one word which has no such claim at all may be rhymed, and what happens in such a case. Earlier it states that "adherents to the doctrine of apocope" hold that words entitled to an -e "always must have it pronounced in rhyme." But what, for example about the word *thing* (pp. 160 ff.) rhyming with the present participle *yimaginyn* (E 596-598)? Historically *thing* should have no -e,<sup>1</sup> and, as the evidence is printed, with no -e required in 374 easy scensions and nearly all the evidence here from rhyme merely negative (so Miss McJimsey mistakenly observes,

<sup>1</sup> But cf. the plural form in *Havelok*, 66, and *Piers Plowman*, B, vi, 212.

cf. p. 14), one might infer that the *-e* is absent in both cases. But *thing* appears many times in rhyme with gerunds (e. g. A 275-276 and the evidence on pp. 160 ff.) and these occasionally rhyme with infinitives (BD, Robinson ed., 639-640 and TC iv, 239-241) or participles (A 901-902; yet cf. BD, Robinson ed., 1327-1328). Must we assume that in rhyme *-e* is added in all such cases or that it is lost?

In fact one can offer some argument to the effect that there is more evidence from rhyme that *thing* has an *-e* than that *yeer* has (cf. p. 104), which, we note, sometimes rhymes with *neer* (adv.?) and never takes an *-e* within the line. Yet the author writes of *yeer* as if it had apparently gone over entirely to the *-e* classification (p. 214) and speaks of the "confusion of *-eer* and *ere*" (p. 104). It is notable, however, that she does not put the word in the class IC ("Certain monosyllabic nouns for which there is evidence of the pronunciation of *-e*, in Chaucerian usage occur one or more times when the *-e* is not necessary in scansion," pp. 77-78.) Here the need of a test of monosyllables other than nouns (e. g. *neer*, cf. BD, Robinson ed., 133-134 and 449-450), and indeed of words other than monosyllables, becomes evident. If *thing*, which sometimes rhymes with a word entitled to an *-e* and sometimes with a word that has no such claim, can have no *-e*, then it is certain, apart from other evidence, that Chaucer allowed rhymes of that type. If he did, the positive evidence of rhyme is diminished. We may ask just how often he did this, and how far the reader is warned by the first word in rhyme that such will be the case. Supplementary material is necessary for us to answer these questions, and they play a great part in the final evaluation of the evidence Miss McJimsey has put before us.

Other problems appear in the monograph but this discussion will suffice to show that the study must eventually be carried further. There are a few minor points of criticism, however, that may be added: p. vii, the extension of dative *-e* to other than petrified phrases has long been recognized and hardly furnishes a "new" category, and most of the "working of rules and exceptions in other parts of speech" has been known before (e. g. that "The infinitive *-e* is a sturdy survival"). P. 213, the statement that neuter inorganic *-e* derives from an "inflected nominative and accusative plural" is doubtful in view of the use of nouns like *dale* and *grave*, and in any case it is hard to see how the present study shows that the theory "continues to be likely." P. 218, the assumption of a doubled (more properly, lengthened) consonant in Chaucer is of doubtful validity. I note two corrections: p. 24, *Chaucerian* for *Caucerian*; p. 184, *chiere* for *cause*. As far as I have tested it, the book shows a really extraordinary degree of accuracy in reference and in presentation.

HOWARD R. PATCH

*Smith College*

---

*The Art of Dying Well: The Development of the Ars Moriendi.* By Sister MARY CATHARINE O'CONNOR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xiv + 258.

Sister Mary's study of this popular book of the fifteenth century takes the following form: An Introduction discusses the nature of the work; Part I considers the question of priority between the two versions, then literary precursors and the sources, the composition of the texts, and the problem of authorship; Part II lists the MSS.; Part III treats the editions, xylographic and from movable type; Part IV describes books, contemporary and later, Catholic and post-Reformation, that were composed in the tradition of the *Ars Moriendi*.

Sister Mary makes clear that the *Ars* was intended primarily for secular readers, and conjectures that the plague may have created the need for such a work. Comparing the two versions, CP (the longer) and QS (that used in the wood-blocks), she reaches the conclusion that QS is later than, and an abridgment of, CP, with additional matter from other sources which yet improves the unity of the whole. The present reviewer finds her argument sound.

The different use made of Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 1115a (nothing is so terrible as death) plays a rôle in this argument, and Sister Mary correctly stresses the popularity of the citation. Following a method not unlike that of CP, Gianfrancesco Pico in his discourse on death (ch. 10) in *De Imaginazione* (A. D. 1500) first quotes this passage from Aristotle, and then in opposition cites Epictetus, *Ench.* 5 (death itself is nothing terrible) and St. Ambrose, *De Bono Mortis* (far from being terrible, death is to be sought; cf. 403b ff. I am surprised that this work seems not to have exerted an influence upon the *Ars Moriendi*). Aristotle's words are also cited (but attributed to St. Augustine) by the author-compiler of the so-called 'Aquinas'-tract on the art of preaching (*saec. xv*) to illustrate how the *prelocutio* of a sermon can be formed by adducing authorities in support of the *thema* (*Ecclesiasticus* 41. 1: O death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee). Furthermore, Pico, like the author of CP, cites the Scriptural passage Phil. 1. 21 ff., and the author of the 'Aquinas'-tract, like the author of CP, cites Vulg. Ps. 34. 21. In both text and notes throughout her book Sister Mary supplies interesting information; if she should in the future compare the contents of the *Ars Moriendi* with material doubtless to be found in the sermons of the period, she would place us further in her debt. The aim of instruction and in particular the method of interrogation employed in the *Ars Moriendi* alone suggest a close analogy with preaching.

Sutton's *Disce Mori* (p. 200 of Sister Mary's book) proclaims the art of dying as superior to any of the liberal arts. Compare the introductory poem addressed to William of Auvergne in a fifteenth-

century copy (Paris, Bibl. Nat. Rés. D. 15239 = Hain-Copinger 8305) of his *Rhetorica Divina*, a rhetoric of prayer: Vain was the instruction of the rhetoricians, who 'taught only to move the heart of a human judge; whereas our lofty art teaches how to mollify the just wrath of that Great Judge, even God.' To express the high esteem in which some of the authors (e.g., pp. 177, 205) hold the art of dying, they employ the same term—'the art of arts' or 'the science of sciences'—as St. Gregory, *Reg. Past.* ch. 1, uses for the art of governing souls (pastoral teaching), and the author of the 'Aquinus'-tract for preaching. In like fashion Boncampagno and Mino da Colle regard *dictamen* as 'empress' of the liberal arts, or as 'queen' of the sciences.

In order to discover the sources (the most important source was the section in Gerson's *Opus Tripartitum* which treats of dying) Sister Mary studies the texts carefully, and her speculations on how these were composed appear valid. We learn that the *Ars* could not have been written before 1408, that it was composed in the vicinity of Constance, and perhaps at the time when the Council was held there. The evidence, in great part external, leads Sister Mary to believe that the author, who remains *incertus*, was probably a Dominican.

Well over three hundred MS. copies of the *Ars*, in Latin and a number of vernacular tongues, are listed; one MS., at Karlsruhe, is dated as early as 1431. Information obtained from catalogues Sister Mary occasionally supplemented with data acquired from librarians and from the study of photographs. She is aware that there must exist many copies of which she has no knowledge, and her caution is just, for many collections in Europe have not been catalogued, many catalogues have not been published, some have been published only in incomplete form (e.g., that of Melk, and I would hazard the guess that the Monastery library still contains some at least of those copies she misses from the mediaeval catalogue; see her p. 70 and n. 59), and it is always well to remind the reader that many of the published catalogues contain a great number of errors and omissions. To Sister Mary's list I would add three copies of CP: Paris, Mazarine MS. 970 (*saec. xv*). 1 ff.; Rome, Vatican, Palat. Lat. MS. 676 (*xv*). 84 ff. and MS. 719 (*xv*). 44 ff.

The editions (these exceed forty in number) are considered in some detail, and in their relation to the MSS. I may correct Sister Mary on one item: the colophon of the facsimile (1905) of the edition in Catalan reads Valencia, 1491?, not 1481? (see p. 163 and n. 358 in Sister Mary's book). Palau, *Manual* 1. 121, accords with Haebler's earlier assignment of this edition to Joan Rosenbach (not Rosenberg), Barcelona, c. 1403.

Sister Mary's list of books composed in the tradition of the *Ars Moriendi* was not intended to be exhaustive. She is, and fairly enough, content here to deal with a goodly number of representative

works, mostly English, and leaves to others the task of investigating thoroughly the subject of influence. I would call to the attention of such investigators three works by Jesuits which are listed in Sommervogel's *Dictionnaire*: Bouchy's *L'art de bien mourir, etc.* (Liège, 1635), Hevenesi's *Ars bonae mortis, etc.* (Vienna, 1695), and Trigona's *Arte di ben morire, etc.* (Palermo, 1735). And my colleague, Dr. H. H. King, refers me to the copy of the Portuguese *Arte deuota e dourada para bem morrer* by Dom Damião da Cruz in Coimbra Univ. MS. 1800-1801. 2. 57 ff.

A few notes on minor points: p. 86, n. 130 repeats what is said at the top of p. 87; Antwerp (so on p. 182) appears as Anvers on p. 183; misprints: p. 93, par. 2 *been* for *seen*, p. 98 *Amrosian*, p. 245 *Guiseppé*, p. 78, n. 89 *asetischen*; faulty Greek accents on pp. 11 and 239. Finally, and with all respect for the author of a useful book, the present reviewer cannot praise locutions like *a how-to-die chapter* (p. 19), *the later holy-dying literature* (p. 172), or *the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge edition* (p. 199, n. 198).

HARRY CAPLAN

*Cornell University*

*The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor.* By GRACE EDNA MOORE. (University of Pennsylvania: A Dissertation in English), Philadelphia, 1942. Pp. xci + 142.

The appearance of Miss Moore's dissertation reminds us once more how much remains to be done in the gathering and careful editing of the Middle English saints' legends. Nearly a hundred years have passed since Thorpe's edition of Aelfric's *Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, which contains a number of legends of the saints, and which has long since become a scarce item. The editing of the Old English texts of hagiological context was carried on well nigh to completion in the last years of the last century by Wanley, Earle, Skeat, and others. The relative paucity of manuscripts made this possible. A like service for the Middle English legends has not yet been rendered. The valuable and fairly comprehensive labors of Carl Horstman gave the first considerable impetus to the business of unearthing and of presenting a cross-section of the material extant. The amount of Horstman's publication of legends is really astonishing, but the quality is extremely uneven. He strove to present at least one version of each legend in the successive issues of his *Altenglische Legenden* (1875, 1878, and 1881).<sup>1</sup> Subsequently, the Middle English legends were

<sup>1</sup> See also his publication of the *Scottish Saints*, *Osbern Bokenam's Lives of Saints*, *Nova Legenda Angliae*, etc. The last named is the handiest source for the best known of the Latin versions of English legends.

studied sporadically by various scholars in this country and abroad. An indication of the amount of careful work which still needs to be done may be seen in Miss Moore's model presentation of the St. Edward the Confessor legend. An equally careful consideration needs to be applied to a number of other Middle English legends which still remain in numerous manuscripts. As evidence of the extent of various versions of any one legend may be cited H. R. Luard's *Lives of Edward the Confessor (Rolls Series, London, 1858)*, where are printed an Old French and two Latin versions of the life of the pious king. Miss Moore discusses the relationship and kinds of material dealing with the monarch, particularly the controversial attitudes of the French and the English towards the king. Some attention is given to the life-records in various of the more popular chronicles. Miss Moore does not pretend to completeness in her list but a mention of an Icelandic *Játvarthar Saga* (See Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints*, xi, 327) would be of interest to students of the subject. The avenues of English Hagiology in Icelandic have been little explored.

In her appendix, Miss Moore prints for the first time the Middle English Prose Lives of this saint. The carefulness of Miss Moore's work is to be commended. Two misprints (p. x and p. xlivi n.) might have been avoided. A topical index to all parts of the volume would be a convenient addition.

C. GRANT LOOMIS

*University of California (Berkeley)*

*The Earliest English Poetry.* By CHARLES W. KENNEDY. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1943. Pp. viii + 375. \$3.

This history is described on the title-page as "a critical survey of the poetry written before the Norman conquest." It is well written and abounds in good things: e. g. the treatment of the so-called storm riddles (pp. 140-145, 364-368). Unluckily, however, it suffers from serious deficiencies, and therefore cannot be given unqualified commendation. Graduate students and others professionally interested in OE will look for an index, but in vain, and they will find the "selected bibliography" of seven pages not only too short but also overloaded with lumber: Sec. V in particular includes some worthless and some out-of-date items—a serious matter when the total number of items is only 28. A work of 375 pages on OE poetry ought to take up all the extant poems, but the author has left out the metrical psalms and the meters of Alfred's *Boethius*: in other words, the whole of vol. v of the Krapp-Dobbie corpus. I find no discussion of the *Menologium* either, and various other poems of no great importance are passed over in silence. Of

these, the recently discovered *Stanzaic Poem* (text in Krapp-Dobbie vi 98-104) might at least have been mentioned. In the appendix on the MSS (pp. 353-361) we get no description of CCCC 201 or Cotton Tib. B i, and no mention of the Paris Psalter or Cotton Otho A vi, though all four of these MSS include a good deal of OE verse. Here however the author follows a widespread practice; even the Cambridge Bibliography lists only four instead of eight MSS under "Chief MS Sources of Poetry" (i 62-63).

Space permits only the following comments on slips of the pen and details about which reviewer and author disagree. It is hardly right to call Cædmon a convert (p. 16). I cannot accept the generalization that "there was little room for the trivial or frivolous in OE life or letters" (p. 21), although our scanty records, made by monks, certainly include little that the scribes thought of as trivial or frivolous. The author might have translated the first Ealhchild passage of *Widsith* differently (p. 25) if he had consulted F. Klæber, in *Studia Germanica tillägnade E. A. Kock*, pp. 113-114. The third section of *Deor* has no connection with the Weland story (p. 31); see my paper in *MP* XL 1-18. For my identification of the Theodric of *Deor* the reader should be referred, not to the necessarily summary discussion in my edition of *Deor* (note 19, p. 33), but to the fuller treatment of the matter in *Acta Phil. Scand.* IX 76-84. There is no reason to think that at the end of the Finnsburg fragment the scene shifts from Danes to Frisians (p. 43). Certain Icelandic parallels to the fight with Grendel and his mother undoubtedly localize the fighting, or part of it, behind a waterfall (pp. 69 ff.), but we have no reason to think this localization primitive; it is more plausibly explained as a rationalization of the originally supernatural (hellish) setting. The prophecy attributed to Beowulf (p. 81) is too precise to hold water as prophecy; see my discussion in *JEGP* XXXIX 76-92. If Lotherus is to be mentioned at all in a history of OE poetry, a footnote referring to my paper on him in *Acta Phil. Scand.* XIII 201-214 ought to be given (p. 83), but it would be better to leave him out altogether. The author attaches undue weight to Miss Hotchner's dissertation (p. 106). Miss Kershaw, now Mrs. Chadwick, should be referred to by a feminine pronoun (note 45, p. 124). The opening passage of the second gnomic poem in the Exeter Book is misinterpreted (p. 148); see a paper of mine forthcoming in *Medium Ævum*. In all likelihood the *Dream of the Rood* was composed long before Cynewulf's day (p. 261). The author is surely wrong in divorcing *The Grave* from the poetic type in which the soul addresses its dead body (p. 330).

KEMP MALONE

*Stolne and Surreptitious Copies, A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos.* By ALFRED HART. Melbourne, Victoria: Melbourne University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 478. 12s. 6d.

The desideratum today is a comprehensive study which will establish the genus of bad quartos by fully investigating each corrupt text and comparing it with its fellows. The book under review is not such a study.

Hart deals only with the bad quartos of Shakespeare. Of these he concerns himself only with the corrupt versions of *2, 3 H VI*, *HV*, *Hamlet*, *MWofW*, and *R&J*. The omission of *Pericles* one can perhaps understand; there is no corresponding good text. But his not investigating the quartos of *Richard III* and *King Lear* is surprising. D. L. Patrick's book on *Richard III* came out in 1936. Greg's famous *Neophilologus* article on *King Lear* came out in 1933. In 1930 Chambers in his authoritative *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems* had already indicated he thought Q *KL* a bad quarto, and Hart refers to this book. The point is not alone that Hart's title is a misnomer. The greater point is that Hart either through incomplete investigation or through failure to read available scholarship has omitted from consideration the very two Shakespeare bad quartos which disprove his central hypothesis: "My thesis is to prove that each bad quarto is a garbled abridgment of an acting version made officially by the play adapter of the company from Shakespeare's manuscript; my aim throughout has been to make even destructive criticism lend some support to this central truth" (p. 437).

This thesis rests on a series of articles which Hart published in *RES* in 1932 and 1934 (viii, 139-54, 395-413; x, 1-28). Their strict burden was that the time length for the performance of an Elizabethan play was two hours, the line length being 2300 to 2400 lines. However, the only exact evidence which we possess concerning the length of Elizabethan performance is comprised in the extant promptbooks which give unassailable evidence of having been used in the theatre for actual performance. In his 1934 article (p. 3) Hart has a statistical table dealing with these MSS. He arrives at an average length of 2358 lines. Of Hart's sixteen, Greg in *Elizabethan Dramatic Documents* allows only twelve into his group of promptbooks which show evidence of actual theatrical use. According to Hart's numbering, in these twelve *I Richard II* has the greatest length (2830 lines) and *John a Kent* has the shortest (1638 lines). Of the twelve, five are above 2500 lines and two are below 2000. Surely, casting an average here is useless. All that we can say is that sometimes an Elizabethan performance could be 2800 lines (or longer) or 1600 lines (or shorter).

But Hart's particular hypothesis in the book under review—that the Shakespeare bad quartos are reports of the good versions abridged to around 2300 lines for performance—is automatically invalidated when we include Qq. of *RIII* and *KL* among the stolne and surreptitious texts. The Q length of *RIII* is 3389 lines (F is 3570). The Q length of *KL* is 3092 lines (F is 2899). No, it is not abridgment which lies behind the shortness of most of the bad versions. It is faulty memorizing. Until we have exhausted the memorial reconstruction hypothesis, we should not look elsewhere for an explanation of the various differences between good and bad versions. When Greg points to purposive abridgment in *Orlando Furioso*, we can point to "telescoping," the memory's skipping from one line to a further line because of similar phraseology or theme. When Schücking points to purposive stage adaptation to account for the different position of scenes in Q1 of *Hamlet*, we can point to gross memorial confusion (see "The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet*," *MLN*, LV [1940], 382-87).

Not alone is Hart's main thesis wrong, but this supposedly comprehensive monograph on the Shakespeare bad quartos, 478 pages long, adds little to what we already know of their corruption. A crying need is a study of the bad quarto of *HV* as a memorial reconstruction; Hart gives very little space to the matter. He does not even notice the important problem of bibliographical links between good and bad versions. His chapter, "Emendations of Shakespeare's Text from the Bad Quartos," hardly begins to scratch the surface. His many pages on "echoes" in the bad quartos of passages from other plays (pp. 352-402) are completely undiscriminating. Hart's section on the faulty meter in the bad quartos serves no purpose. Chapters III through VI show by statistical tables that the relationship between a bad text and its good text in the matter of vocabulary is not like the relationship between a source play and Shakespeare's resultant play. This is intended to confute those who believe that Shakespeare rewrote the bad text into the good text. But who today believes this? Throughout the book, spreading confusion in all directions, is Hart's thesis that the bad quartos represent abridgments.

Concomitant with this thesis is Hart's belief that the bad quartos are reports reconstructed from memory of performance by pirate actors. At the 1937 meeting of the M. L. A., in a paper entitled "A Proposed Solution to the Problem of the Bad Quartos," this reviewer suggested that a bad quarto was created by a reporter's memorizing from a theatrical MS. Mnemonic phenomena which adumbrate a single memory; stage-directions which are like those of the promptbooks; patches of correctly lined blank verse; small patches of perfect reproduction in the midst of wild confusion; isolated bibliographical links of spelling, punctuation, capitalization between the good and bad texts of *HV*, *IHVI*, *MWofW*,

*Hamlet*—these show us a reporter imperfectly remembering what he has seen on the written page. No other theory accounts for all the phenomena which make up a bad quarto. The Admiral's men had to pay two pounds "to stay the printing" of *Patient Grissill* on March 18, 1600, only a few weeks after the play was first produced. The only probable explanation would seem to be that a stationer was preparing to print a bad quarto created according to the hypothesis outlined above. At the end of *Edward I* we find, "Yours. By George Peele, Maister of Artes in Oxenford." The preface to the Malone Society reprint (1911) reads. "The authorship is attested in the printed editions by a curious colophon evidently copied from the manuscript."—Rather memorized from the manuscript, for *Edward I* is a bad quarto.

LEO KIRSCHBAUM

St. Louis University

---

*The Globe Playhouse: Its Design and Equipment.* By JOHN CRANFORD ADAMS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942. Pp. xiv + 420. \$5.00.

This study of the Globe Playhouse follows close upon G. F. Reynolds' monograph on another theater of the same period, *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater, 1605-1625*, though Mr. Adams' work was apparently in press before the appearance of Mr. Reynolds' book in 1940. The two studies are notably different in method. Mr. Reynolds, limiting his inquiry to plays for which we have evidence of performance at the Red Bull and interpreting his findings with utmost caution, concluded that very few details of the structure of the Red Bull stage could be determined with any certainty. Even the existence of an inner (alcove) stage could not be demonstrated; simultaneous staging and similar devices of medieval theatrical technique would suffice for presenting scenes in Red Bull plays which we usually assign to the inner stage.

Mr. Adams does not share the conservatism which made Mr. Reynolds' results seem disappointingly inconclusive to students of the Elizabethan drama. On the contrary, by gathering up all the shreds of available evidence and piecing them together by ingenious conjecture, Mr. Adams reconstructs the Globe Playhouse and its equipment down to the last detail and dimension.<sup>1</sup> The cogency of

<sup>1</sup> One of Mr. Adams' chief arguments for the exact dimensions he assigns to the Globe is based on the width of the stage (43 ft.) specified in the Fortune contract, which he maintains (p. 22 and elsewhere) would be an arbitrary width in a rectangular playhouse. But suppose the octagonal Globe was designed with two 12-ft. bays to each of the eight sides, and the platform stage extended from the middle post of one side to the middle post

his arguments varies with the different points he seeks to establish. He is wholly convincing, for example, on the octagonal shape of the Globe, the position of the "gentlemen's rooms," and the location of the main trap. On other matters his case is less persuasive; on still others it has merely a thin tissue of conjecture to support it. In citing stage directions as evidence, Mr. Adams, unlike Mr. Reynolds, draws upon the whole body of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama without establishing the date of the extant text of each play cited or determining whether the play was written for the Globe. His justification is the belief that all public playhouses of the early seventeenth century were "essentially uniform" in design (p. 356), and that the structural details of the second Globe reproduced those of the first—assumptions that are debatable, as the differing descriptions of the staging of Heywood's Red Bull play *The Silver Age* given by Mr. Adams and Mr. Reynolds clearly demonstrate.

To examine critically the evidence for any single feature of Mr. Adams' conjectural reconstruction of the Globe demands the space of an article rather than a review. The vague hints provided by stage directions and contemporary references are often susceptible to two or more interpretations. But, now that Mr. Adams has presented a coherent picture including every feature of the design of the Globe instead of the piece-meal descriptions we have had in the past, those who defend alternative explanations of the scant evidence will need to make sure that their theories are equally consonant with a workable reconstruction of the whole. For Mr. Adams offers us a practicable theater of great flexibility, consisting of at least five different stages that were part of the playhouse structure: the outer stage; the inner stage or "study"; the "chamber" above, at the second level of the tiring-house; the window stages flanking the "chamber"; and the music room at the third level of the tiring-house. He believes that when the Lord Chamberlain's Men built their playhouse in 1599 they incorporated in its design every device that past experience had suggested as theatrically useful, and he demonstrates how these devices would lend themselves to strikingly effective staging of Elizabethan plays. He exhibits a keen awareness of the materials and methods of construction available to the sixteenth-century architect, and makes clear that the Globe he pictures solved its structural problems in strict accord with contemporary practice.

We may wonder whether the Elizabethans were as ingenious as

of the next side but one. Then, says Mr. Adams, the width of the Globe stage would be exactly 43 ft. The Fortune presumably copied this width without the structural reason for it. Here, however, an error in mathematics destroys the value of the argument; under the given assumptions the width of the Globe stage works out to just under 41 ft. instead of 43 ft. [24 ft. plus twice the side of a 45-degree triangle whose hypotenuse is 12 ft.]

the modern student in perceiving all the theatrical possibilities latent in their playhouse structure. Thus we may remain uncertain whether the Globe described in this book corresponds precisely to the Globe of Shakespeare's company. Nevertheless, Mr. Adams' Globe Playhouse is certainly a highly workable theater, built within the limitations imposed upon the Elizabethan carpenter by his materials. It represents what the ideal public playhouse of Shakespeare's age might possibly have been.

FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

*Stanford University*

---

*The Letters of John Dryden with Letters Addressed to Him.* Collected and edited by CHARLES E. WARD. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1942. Pp. xviii + 196. \$3.00.  
*Defoe's Sources for Robert Drury's Journal.* By JOHN ROBERT MOORE. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Publications, 1943. Pp. 87. \$.75. (Humanities Series No. 9.)

Mr. Ward's is the first attempt to assemble and edit Dryden's letters since that of Edmond Malone in 1800. But devoted and competent research over a period of years has repaid Mr. Ward with small returns, for there are assembled here but seventy-seven letters in all, sixty-two of them written by Dryden and fifteen addressed to him by various correspondents. Indeed, during the century and a half since Malone's book appeared—*The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden*—there have been brought to light and printed only seventeen new letters by Dryden. One of these is the find of Mr. Ward (from the collection of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania), No. 5 of the present edition, which he believes to be addressed to Viscount Latimer in 1677—the year when *All for Love* was produced. He also prints for the first time the full text of five letters by William Walsh and thus fills out the important Dryden-Walsh run. But to estimate the contribution of the volume in these terms is misleading. It is a service of value to bring the letters together, to establish accurate texts by reference to the originals (half of which are in this country), to date them, to identify correspondents, and to furnish explanatory notes.

It is also a good office to give Dryden a chance to speak without interruption. In these pages one feels close to the man in his latter years—honest ("dissembling, though lawfull in some Cases, is not my talent"), resolutely forthright, a little sour, always taking life hard. One understands better the human side of an austere poet from his own accounts of the staging of his plays; of his excursions into his native Northamptonshire "to unwear my selfe, after my studyes" or "to drudge for the winter"; of his great translating

venture—"I have undertaken to translate all Virgil." One is touched and impressed by his allegiance, to the very end, to the Jacobite cause and the Catholic religion: "I can never go an Inch beyond my Conscience & my Honour. . . . I can neither take the oathes, nor forsake my Religion . . . not being capable of renouncing the Cause, for which I have so long Sufferd." Many of the letters are written, as he says, "without poetry, from the botome of my Heart." All are of one piece whether addressed to his literary friends and patrons, his publisher Tonson, his dear sons, Pepys ("Padron Mio"), honored Dr. Busby, or his kinswoman, Elizabeth Stewart of Cotterstock.

But this reviewer, at least, does not agree with Mr. Ward that these personal letters "form almost the only real source for a study of the man." For the many dedications, that is the public letters addressed to Dorset, Leveson-Gower, Sedley, Congreve, et al—which, it may be, should have had a place in this book—are documents rich in the personal details needed for a biographical study. Although another serious biography seems not now to be justified, until that time this edition of his letters should take its place on the shelf of indispensables with Hugh Macdonald's *Bibliography* (1939) and James Osborn's *Biographical Facts and Problems* (1940).

The title *Madagascar: or Robert Drury's Journal . . . Written by Himself* (1729) was queried in Trent's bibliography of Defoe in the CHEL. In the CBEL, it was included by H. C. Hutchins among the authenticated works. In the meantime the idea—tossed about for many years—was taking shape that this book, the most valuable English work on Madagascar, was not the record of one man's actual experience but was a characteristic travel romance by the author of *Robinson Crusoe*. The case for Defoe's authorship was first supported with documented statements of his style, method, and ideas by J. R. Moore in *Defoe in the Pillory and Other Studies* (1939). Mr. Moore, in this recent brochure, expands and illustrates his argument and explores the possible sources of the *Journal*.

He has acquired several new slants since the earlier work: for example, he now believes that although the *Journal* is probably based chiefly on printed sources, there is less dependence upon Flacourt and Ogilby, that there is discernible a marked reliance upon the oral communication of voyagers, among them possibly Madagascar ex-pirates, and that fictitious though the framework is, there is much factual realism in the account of the island. The possible sources, considered with minute attention, are John Benbow's lost manuscript journal; Robert Knox's *Ceylon*, together with his conversation and his unpublished autobiographical manuscript; Robert Everard's *Relation*; *Atlas Geographus* and similar works derived from Flacourt; information secured through oral trans-

mission and untraced manuscripts; and Defoe's own previously expressed knowledge of Madagascar. The appended word list and map are studied in their relation to the *Journal*. Throughout, the implication is that the last thing may not yet have been said.

The analysis is presented with explicitness—and with gusto. Mr. Moore is an enthusiast for the Drury kind of tale and for Drury's creator, "the elderly literary gentleman in his famous study at Stoke Newington."

RAE BLANCHARD

\* Goucher College

*The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope.* Edited by JOHN BUTT. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942. Vol. II, *The Rape of the Lock and Other Poems*, ed. GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Pp. xx + 410. Vol. IV, *Imitations of Horace with An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot and The Epilogue to the Satires*, ed. JOHN BUTT. Pp. liv + 406. \$4.00 each.

These two volumes are the first installment of a new six-volume edition of Pope's poetical works, excluding the translation of Homer, executed on such a scale that it should supersede the Elwin-Courthope. It is to be hoped that the distribution of the task among several editors will make possible an early completion of the whole work. Pope has suffered more than any other English poet from a succession of unsympathetic editors, and even the Elwin-Courthope edition, which has long been standard, suffers from the incongruity of two different critical attitudes as well as from its now antiquated scholarship. This new edition not only incorporates a considerable mass of new information which has accumulated during the last fifty years, but also reflects the changed tone of modern discussion of Pope, both as man and as poet.

Although much of the annotation and commentary must of course resume the accumulations of the past editors, even a casual examination of these volumes will reveal extensive and important new additions. One notes, for instance, frequent significant references to such new sources as the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Along with the text of *The Fourth Satire of Dr. John Donne* we have on opposite pages its scarce first form, *The Impertinent*. Pope's original version of the *Second Satire of Dr. Donne* is printed for the first time from a manuscript volume of poems in the British Museum. Courthope is corrected on his ingenious assumption that Warburton, not Pope, devised the titles *Prologue to the Satires* and *Epilogue to the Satires*. The discussion of Pope's relations with Addison conforms with the recently discovered evidence. The publications by such Pope specialists as R. H. Griffith and George Sherburn have obviously

made a heavy contribution of new material, but the editors have also been industrious and painstaking in their own researches. An edition which represents such an advance must be regarded as indispensable.

Mr. Tillotson's commentary on Pope's earlier poems is especially refreshing and illuminating. The modernizations of Chaucer are discussed against a background of the history of Chaucer's interpretation. Instead of speculations regarding the biographical significance of *Eloisa to Abelard* and the *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*, we have an account of the relation of these poems to the literary traditions of the heroical epistle and the elegy. As readers of Mr. Tillotson's recent volume on the poetry of Pope might expect, his commentary gives an abundance of parallels from Pope's predecessors. Such search for parallels can no doubt be overdone, but Mr. Tillotson nevertheless guides us in the right direction when he says that Pope "was original because he crowded into his poem the best of everything that had already been achieved and heightened it to a new best" (p. 288).

Some readers may question the policy of printing the first, rather than the last, text authorized by the poet, with his revisions given as variants at the bottom of the page. It also seems regrettable that references to Pope's letters should be given, not by date, but by volume and page to the Elwin-Courthope edition, as though this edition were to continue standard indefinitely. But such reservations are of minor importance when weighed against the substantial merits of this important publication.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

*University of Michigan*

---

*The Art of Letter Writing. An Essay on the Handbooks Published in England during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.*  
By JEAN ROBERTSON. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1942. Pp. 80. 7s. 6d.

The continued and conscientious issuance of scholarly books from British presses furnishes double gratification to the American reviewer, both as evidence that liberal studies can be produced in a country far more hard put to it by war than his own is ever likely to be, and as un hoped-for contribution to his own field. Miss Robertson has carefully explored a little dusty corner of the forgotten guides to daily conduct of these centuries. She divides her material into well defined types, each dominating a particular period; traces the influence of each type beyond its heyday, and the change into something else, with accompanying, well selected illustrations; and furnishes a bibliography of these works from 1586-1700, which is considerably extended at both ends by refer-

ences in the text and the annotations. She also pauses to suggest the social significance of these changing models for letter writers and their continental sources and connections. I should have recommended two additional comments. The typical sixteenth century handbook was intended not only for the scholar, as she points out, but for the gentleman as well. As for the English "Secretaries," the use of the epistolary art in a public capacity seems not to have interested the English this century as it did the Italians, who wrote "Secretaries" for the guidance of courtiers serving their lords in that office. The second part of Day's "The English Secretorie," published first in the second edition (1592), contains a section entitled, "Of the parts, place, and office of a secretorie," which would seem to be the only exception.

The illustrative letters are highly suggestive of the value of these handbooks for students of social customs. I. P.'s letter in "Cupids Messenger" (1629), "To his mistris (quondam) having spent all his meanes upon her in prosperitie, he being imprisoned she forsakes him," is in the very best vein of vituperation used by calumniators of women from Matheolus on. Gainsford's letter in "The Secretories Studie" (1616) on "Whether a Gentlewoman may with her credit, let out lodgings for money" recalls the question Edmond Bolton tried to settle in his "Cities Advocate" (written about the same time), whether a gentleman's son apprenticesed to a trade lost his gentility. Bolton stoutly maintained that he did not and might therefore challenge any gentleman, however unapprenticed, to a duel. The gentlewoman, as usual, is bound by severer restrictions if she would maintain her gentility. The answer is no: for "A Gentlewoman, whether widow or wife, liuing in the freedome of reputation, is not to be seruile in any thing, nor to bedurtie herselfe with the dregges of any covetousnesse, or sinister practises against her credite."

Miss Robertson's compact account is to be welcomed, for, to my mind, the existence of an earlier study of the English letter writer, evidently unknown to her, does not destroy its usefulness. Miss Katherine Gee Hornbeak in "The Complete Letter Writer in English 1568-1800," published in 1934 (*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, Vol. 15), had already surveyed the same material at greater length with essentially the same results for the period in which the two coincide. For its much greater amount of analysis, illustration and comparison of many of the examples her study is to be preferred by anyone interested especially in the books themselves (particularly if inaccessible), and also by anyone viewing letter writers as a part of the development of the novel, Miss Hornbeak's own interest. Miss Robertson, on the other hand, gives a clearer, more easily grasped account of the whole course of letter writers in England for her two centuries since she can begin with the early Latin formularies and Erasmus's all pervading pattern, and can fit everything into place without resort to footnote

and appendix additions. Her bibliography is far more usable organized alphabetically by authors than the other which lists the titles of both new books and new editions under the year of publication, and it contains some twenty more items. This recent essay is likely to prove more accessible to students, appearing as a distinct work. Publication in a college series unfortunately is almost tantamount to burial—cataloguing fashions being what they are, and the English scholar can readily be forgiven for not having run across the American work. Any balance against her is at least partly restored by Miss Hornbeak's having missed the fact recorded by Miss Robertson that R. B. McKerrow had already established the source of Fullwood's "The Enimie of Idleness" (*Gentleman's Magazine*, May, 1906).

RUTH KELSO

*The University of Illinois*

---

*A Preface to Paradise Lost.* By C. S. LEWIS. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 139. \$2.25.  
*Poets and Their Critics: Langland and Milton.* Warton Lecture on English Poetry, 1941. By R. W. CHAMBERS. [Reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xxvii.] London: Humphrey Milford, [1941]. Pp. 48. \$1.25.

Mr. Lewis has written a book that answers a real need. Here at last, for teacher and student, is an introduction to the reading of *Paradise Lost* which is brief, helpful, entertaining, and stimulating. It contains no chart of Milton's cosmology, no complicated researches into Milton's sources, no subtle interpretations of Milton's meaning, and no sales talk on Milton's sublimity. Instead, with wit and common sense it examines the principal difficulties which confront the modern reader, explains how these may be surmounted (not avoided!), and points the way to both understanding and enjoyment. The *Preface to Paradise Lost* is an excellent book to put into the hands of intelligent students, for it will jolt them, amuse them, and clear their heads of a good many misconceptions, not only about Milton, but also about the older poetry in general. It will do their elders no harm, either.

Lewis's method is to strip a problem to teasingly simple fundamentals, illuminate those fundamentals with a colorful analogy or two, and then demand that the reader make his choice. Not every reader will accept Lewis's alternatives, but all should find it invigorating to watch him present them. His book is really more than an exposition of *Paradise Lost*; it is also an eloquent defence of the rôle of ritual and "stock responses" and "civility" in human

life. But chiefly Lewis pleads that twentieth century readers make an effort to achieve seventeenth century attitudes, taking Milton as he meant to be taken. To appreciate *Paradise Lost* as a work of art, one must imaginatively recover a lost attitude toward epic. To appreciate the epic's meaning, one must recover a lost attitude toward theology and pneumatology and hierarchy. Lewis shows how, with occasional remarks on the mistaken notions of Eliot, Saurat, Tillyard, and others.

Some American scholars will resent the way in which American scholarship is totally ignored in the book, especially since the author advertises that he and Mr. Charles Williams have found "a true critical attitude after more than a hundred years of laborious misunderstanding." In the realms of gold Mr. Lewis imagines himself a stouter and more vocal Cortez—the wrong man at the right place. But only those who prefer history to poetic experience will cry "Balboa!" for his words have a high specific gravity when measured against much that passes for Milton criticism today.

The late R. W. Chambers knew well the backbiting poverty of some of that criticism, and in his Warton Lecture of 1941 he summoned scholarship and common sense to provide a pauper's burial for the "Lower Biography" as represented by the *Studies* of S. B. Liljegren. *Poets and Their Critics* is a spirited attack upon views which impede our understanding of "the great tradition of fortitude in English poetry," and it urges us to say a decisive "Yes" or "No" to a complexity of theories which we have hitherto tolerated as "interesting." After saying "No" to the theory of the multiple authorship of *Piers Plowman*, Chambers gives an equally emphatic negative to the recent detractors of Milton's sincerity and honor. Particularly valuable is an eleven-page note on "the 'Pamela-prayer,' and other alleged frauds of Milton," in which Liljegren's well known accusations are pronounced—and conclusively proved—"inane." The whole unfortunate matter may now be forgotten.

WILLIAM R. PARKER

*Ohio State University*

---

*London in Flames, London in Glory.* By R. A. AUBIN. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1943. Pp. xvi + 383. \$4.50.

Mr. Aubin has collected a group of poems concerned with the fire and rebuilding of London in the seventeenth century and issues them at a time when the old city's life is again threatened and her sons once more need courage for present and future. The poems, it must be confessed, are more curious than exciting. The editor is

abundantly aware that he needs the type of benevolent reader who, as he says himself, will accept pieces of this sort in the spirit voiced by Lord Palmerston when he was offered the Order of the Garter: "Splendid! There's no d—d merit in it!" Most of these city poets must have belonged to Elkanah Settle's breed, and their metrical lucubrations are for the most part dull and spiritless refashionings of the expected. Deprecation of God's judgments figures largely in most of them, along with accounts of the progress of the fire, charges against the Dutch and Jesuits, similes involving Sodom, Rome, and that wretched bird the Phoenix, astonishing conceits like the one about good Eliza in stone on the outside arch of the burning prison casting her eye on Whitehall,

But when she saw her *Palace* safe, her fears  
Vanish, one Eye drops *smiles*, the other *tears*.

The Jeremiads try so hard to be impressive, and too often succeed in being merely ridiculous.

'Wake sottish *Island*! let thy ruins teach  
Thy Sons and Daughters to bewail the *Breach*.  
Where are thy *Noahs*, *Daniels* and *Jobs*?  
Are these the men, that in their linsie *Robes*  
Chant their Devotions? th' Angels of the *Quire*,  
Whose very *Noses* threat their *shirts* with fire;  
Whose *Bacchanalian* zeal's a flame they stole  
Not from the *Altar*,<sup>\*</sup> but *Maconian* coal.  
Are these the men, that with their *Pipes* can do  
The *Counter-wonder* on a *Jericho*?

Apparently even the four Horsemen of the Apocalypse could not frighten the Londoner of that day out of his beer. Gluttony was the sin, as the wooden statue of the fat boy on Pie Corner used to tell us, or was it stage-plays, or our neglect in not returning gratitude and obedience to God for "that wonderful and merciful Restauration" of Charles II? "God did blow the coal."

When the Salamander-Muse, as Simon Ford calls his "poor Girl," turns from the burning to the rebuilding of London, the themes become at least more varied. Metrical language does occasionally in these poems what it should do; it narrows the shutter and gives us more clearly defined pictures. The meters vary from the humble fourteener to the top-lofty Pindaric, and practically every bad literary fashion of the time is exemplified.

The poems are edited with scrupulous care. The notes are both explanatory and illustrative, and never, I think, irrelevant. They will keep some readers awake who may perchance grow drowsy over the verses.

WILLIAM HENRY IRVING

*Duke University*

*The Later Career of Tobias Smollett.* By LOUIS L. MARTZ. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 213. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 97.)

Dr. Martz's theme is threefold: (a) Smollett's style changed considerably between 1753 and 1771; (b) this was primarily due to the novelist's extensive "historical" writings; and (c) such labors were typical of the mid-century, which was an "age of synthesis." The volume includes an introductory survey of some intellectual trends in the eighteenth century and of Smollett's career; contains a detailed investigation of the *Compendium of Voyages*, as well as an examination of the *Travels, Adventures of an Atom* and the *Present State of all Nations*; and is concluded by an attempt to evaluate the effect of Smollett's work and interests during this period on the style and content of his later works, particularly *Humphrey Clinker*.

The chief value of this study is its analytical evaluation of the *Compendium* and the *Present State*, which have received slight attention heretofore. Also meritorious are the considerations of style and sources of the *Travels* and *Adventures of an Atom*, and of *Humphrey Clinker* itself, upon which Dr. Martz rightly focuses his attention. Scholars have long been aware of the general literary phenomena which form Dr. Martz's point of departure, but Smollett's work has not hitherto been used extensively as a case history, nor has the *Present State* been examined in any detail as contributing to the general movement or to the change in Smollett's own style. An estimate of the exact indebtedness of the *Travels* and *Humphrey Clinker* to popular guide books and travels is another of Dr. Martz's accomplishments.

At times, Dr. Martz falls into the common error of accepting his own hypotheses as facts. Further, he seems to me to underestimate the effects of Smollett's medical training, as well as his work for the *Critical Review*, *Complete History of England*, and the *Modern Part of the Universal History*. Dr. Martz mentions all these, but briefly, although their combined value in any estimate of Smollett's later work is considerable. *The Later Career* is, however, a significant contribution to Smollett scholarship and provides others interested in Smollett with many leads for future work. It is hoped, however, that Miss Norwood's Smollett Bibliography and Professor Knapp's Life of Smollett will be available to future scholars intending to treat the novelist in any considerable detail.

CLAUDE E. JONES

Headquarters, 11ND.,  
San Diego, California

*Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris*; an interpretation and a critical analysis by J. BOYD. Oxford: Blackwell, 1942 (12/6).

Professor Boyd, who has recently (in the new and distinguished series of Blackwell's German Texts) shown himself to be a judicious editor of Goethe's poems, has now published a study of *Iphigenie*. His sub-title, I fear, overstates the scope of his attempt—instead of an “interpretation,” he submits a useful running commentary, scene by scene, on the psychological and dramatic plausibility of Goethe's play. In a brief Introduction, he summarizes the gradual transformation of the Greek matter, and reminds us that the awkward humanitarian twist of the fable is common to several pre-Goethean *Iphigenie* plays. For his general appraisal of the work itself Mr. Boyd does not, apparently, wish to go beyond the conventional terminology; but it should have been possible to eliminate from a serious argument such loose terms as: “an objective play,” or: “reflecting some of Goethe's own experiences”; or so shop-worn and merely entertaining a metaphor as (p. 16): “Goethe had suffered the pursuit of the Furies after his shameful desertion of Friederike Brion.”

On the whole, however, Mr. Boyd is a fair reader. He refuses to be troubled by what most critics have felt to be the extraordinarily problematical position of *Iphigenie* within the whole canon of Goethe's earlier work. With all its seeming “objectivity,” it is, as Mr. Trevelyan has recently reminded us, a work of transition; and as such it is the crux and touchstone of any interpretation, not only of the coherence of Goethe's poetic life, but of the very nature of his idiom. Mr. Boyd's learning (of which a varied appendix of notes gives ample evidence) has, I suspect, prevented him from judging the poetic issue directly and freshly. Indeed, with the kind or intensity of the play's texture, he is not really concerned. Instead, he is anxious to praise the correctness of Goethe's weave and to point to an occasional implication that might not at once be obvious. In some respects, of course, he is bound to invite disagreement—not, perhaps, so much in his exposition of details as in the general direction of his critical approach. His discussion, for instance (p. 70 ff.) of the discrepancy in the third act, between Iphigenie's “barbaric” nature and her qualities of eighteenth-century “humanitarianism” shows the limited validity of his method. Why, he asks, should we demand of Iphigenie a consistency which does not “in reality” exist? And must we not question “Goethe's wisdom in choosing a Greek theme as a vehicle for modern thought”? Goethe's defence, Mr. Boyd submits, might be that, in all his productions, “the ethics were of only secondary importance; he was in the first place an artist and a poet, and never dramatized a subject for the sake of the ideology or the moral it was capable of expounding, but because he saw in it suitable

material for a poetic work. The 'Idee' grew spontaneously out of the subject." This must seem a strangely simplified answer—but Mr. Boyd reduces the Iphigenie dilemma still further: "the only valid question . . . is whether in thus taxing his reader's imagination by a combination of extremes (!), Goethe has not made undue demands on the reader's imagination, thus detracting from his aesthetic enjoyment of the poem. . . ." Surely the greatness of the play does not primarily lie in the "charm" of its "message," but in the manner in which the fundamental dichotomy is being dramatically and poetically evolved.

Mr. Boyd (p. 93 ff.) deals at some length with the healing of Orest. He would not find this issue nearly so troublesome if he did not insist on treating it, again, as a problem of psychological consistency, but, rather, as a poetic device which must be tested, not so much for its naturalistic plausibility as for the efficacy of its dramatic function. His summary (pp. 116-124) of the critics' divergent views of Iphigenie's prayer is more successful, and there is much in Mr. Boyd's examination of Act V that will be readily welcomed by teacher and student alike. He ends with an interpretation of Thoas' "Lebt wohl!" which shows, I think, that in spite of the insufficiently astringent critical attitude, he approaches the human issue of the play with much sympathetic warmth. "Thoas," he concludes (p. 139), "is the tragic figure of the play. His is the sacrifice and the future loneliness." Possibly so, but I am not certain that this is not a somewhat parenthetical reflection.

We shall be grateful for Mr. Boyd's convenient book, but we hope that he can be patient with those who will insist on pushing the critical appraisal of so cardinal a work a good deal further than he has chosen to do.

VICTOR LANGE

*Cornell University*

---

*The Spirit of the Age.* By JOHN STUART MILL. Introductory essay by FREDERICK A. VON HAYEK. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xxxiii + 94. \$1.50.

From Jan. 6, 1831 to May 29, 1831, John Stuart Mill serially published five sections of an essay, "The Spirit of the Age," in *The Examiner*. They were read by Carlyle who "hunted out" the author, and "his acquaintance," wrote Mill years later, "is the only substantial good I have yet derived from writing these papers."

Their republication, with an introduction by Frederick A. von Hayek, supplies scholars with an accessible edition. Though Mill aptly estimated the work as being the first of his writings of any worth, he omitted it from his *Dissertations and Discussions*; and, until now, scholars have had to read it in *The Examiner*, if they

read it at all. Mr. von Hayek states that its value lies "in the light it throws on one of the most interesting phases of the development of a great figure of the past century," but failed to indicate precisely what. The introduction is excellent so far as it goes, but absence of comment on the contents of the essay itself, failure to compare it with similar contemporary essays on the same theme, omission of comment concerning the *milieu* in which the essay was written and its motivating object, and the lack of any statement relating this early essay to Mill's later, and more important, work, are conspicuous. For, though "The Spirit of the Age" was a tract for the times, it was also a prolegomena to Mill's subsequent political essays.

The controlling idea of the essay is that the generation lived in an age of transition which should be converted to an age of transformation by the redistribution of political power and by the establishment of a new "authority" of scientific knowledge of society and power of adjustment through the selective processes of a democracy more liberal than existed before the passage of the first Reform Bill. Though the essay anticipates some of the work of Carlyle, Disraeli, and Arnold in the criticism of the English aristocracy (pointing out its political ineptitude and its neglect of its responsibilities in readjusting English law and institutions to needs of the new age), its ineffectiveness is obvious when its faulty structure is analyzed. Its five sections are only tenuously connected and its abrupt ending, with an epilogue of five brief paragraphs, suggests either that Mill had not really thought his way through his problem to a workable solution, or that the abrupt shift of tendency in favor of reform caught him unprepared.

The text is well edited but on page 14 the editor might have corrected the sentence, "To be rationally assured that a given doctrine is it [sic] true, is often necessary . . ." and the "s" might have been supplied to "it" in the sentence on page 42: ". . . the former state does not contain in itself the seeds of it [sic] own dissolution."

WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER

Windsor, Connecticut

---

*English Bards and Grecian Marbles, The Relationship between Sculpture and Poetry, Especially in the Romantic Period.* By STEPHEN A. LARRABEE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp ix + 312. \$3.50.

The attitudes of English men of letters to Greek art and culture and the changes wrought in these attitudes in the course of time form a rich and significant, if somewhat neglected, phase of literary history. This book is one of the very few which have appeared in

recent years, treating certain strands in English Hellenism. Mr. Larrabee limits his study to "that English poetry, up to and including the Romantic period, which is inspired by ancient Greek sculpture." His method is primarily critical and only secondarily historical. Thus, after a not very fruitful survey of English poetry which drew inspiration from ancient Greek sculpture from the Twelfth Century to the Romantic period, he turns to the main business of his book, writing separate chapters on Blake, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Landor and Hunt and "The Lesser Poets." His conclusions, based as they are more on critical than on historical analysis, are neither very striking nor especially new: "Blake found in the Antique what he found in all great art: visions expressed in perdurable forms; outlines given to matter by the imagination (p. 119)." "Wordsworth . . . discovered a simplicity, dignity, and grace in modern life comparable to that of the Greeks (p. 148)." "Both the Grecian hatred of tyranny and the devotion to liberty were to be admired and, what is more, to be revived in a world Byron felt was in great need of regeneration (p. 174)." "The ruins of Rome and Greece and the East attracted Shelley, not so much as symbols of physical power or signs of the grandeur of ancient empires, but as 'monuments vital with mind' and testimony to the conquest of matter by the mind of man (p. 201)." "When he [Keats] was under the spell of the ancient marbles, he wrote in a spirit akin to that of the Greeks. . . . In *Endymion*, the 'Ode on a Grecian Urn,' and the 'Ode on Indolence' he described statues and vases, and drew from them images to achieve sculptural effects, that is, to re-create the feeling of sculpture in the medium of the poet (p. 231)." "Among the poets and critics of the Romantic period . . . description of antique forms was supplemented and largely replaced by imaginative and poetic interpretation, and admiration of the canons of proportion of the Antique gave way to study of the inner harmony and organic form (p. 287)."

English Romantic Hellenism produced profound and far-reaching results, and one misses, in this work, the depth with which they might have been searched. The book should, however, stimulate more extensive study of this interesting phase of English literature.

BERNARD H. STERN

*Brooklyn College*

*A Collection of Welsh Riddles.* By VERNAM E. HULL and ARCHER TAYLOR (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. xxvi, no. 3, pp. viii, 225-326), University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1942.

This collection of 485 Welsh riddles brings together in convenient form all available printed sources, some of which are rare and difficult of access. Here for the first time they are translated into English and arranged in general according to the plan of Lehmann-Nitsche's collection of Argentinian riddles, that is, according to construction and not solution. An index of solutions otherwise makes possible the location of any riddle. The editors have called attention to some of the characteristics of Welsh riddles. They are based largely on rural life, as might be assumed, but here striking gaps are found. Counterparts are met for most of the riddles among other peoples, but it is significant that some of the Welsh riddles have no parallels in English. Archer Taylor, who has in manuscript a comprehensive collection of English riddles, was able to verify this fact. Compared with the riddles of other Celtic languages the Welsh riddle does not give evidence of a purely Celtic tradition of riddling; we see rather a strong influence of English riddles upon the Welsh. A striking feature of many Welsh riddles is the rhythm and especially rhyme. The nature of the language lends itself to popular rhymes, and for this reason sometimes extraneous and obscure matter is introduced. The reviewer has been especially interested in those few riddles having affinities to the proverb. The notes have called attention to three of these (nos. 377, 403, 412). There are several others, namely, no. 123: "Fire and water are good servants but bad masters" (Apperson, p. 213); no. 448 and 409: "Like a hog, he does no good till he dies" (ib. p. 494); no. 451: "Money is like muck, not good except it be spread" (ib. p. 422). No. 414 looks as if it were based on a proverb: "Borrowed money doesn't fill the purse," which I have not been able to identify. No. 397 may be compared with the German proverb: "Undank ist das grösste Laster" (Wander IV, 1422), which has antecedents in Latin. The editors have noted that nos. 386-390 seem to show a specifically Welsh tradition of naming three things. This is quite true of the Welsh proverb of which an unusually large number begin with the words "Tri pheth," etc. This formula is so very characteristic also of many of the old Bardic verses that it may represent something indigenous and not necessarily be derived from Biblical influence, as the note suggests. We look forward with interest to an anthology of Irish traditional riddles promised by the editors.

RICHARD JENTE

University of North Carolina

## BRIEF MENTION

*Oenone and Paris.* By T. H. (1594). Edited by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1943. Pp. xlv + 46. \$2.50. In 1937 Dr. Adams reproduced Thomas Middleton's early imitation of Shakespeare, *The Ghost of Lucrece*. He has now edited, from another unique volume, the earliest known imitation—or rather plagiarism—of Shakespeare, the *Oenone and Paris* of 1594. The title corresponds to *Venus and Adonis* and the poem has "the same theme of unrequited love, approximately the same plot, the same setting, the same stanza, the same richly ornate style," and countless clear echoes which are illustrated in the introduction and fully recorded in the notes. When the volume came into fresh notice at Sotheby's sale in 1925, the Shakespearean connection was recognized and Thomas Heywood was suggested as the probable author. Dr. Adams makes out an elaborate and plausible case for Heywood's authorship, though the evidence, being mainly internal, cannot be conclusive—the initials, which fit no other known author of the time; the youthful character of the poem; the fact that it was "the first fruits" of the author's "indeuours"; the abundant marks of a classical education; Heywood's notable fondness for Ovid (especially the story of Oenone and Paris) and Lucian (whose influence Dr. Adams sees in the account of the judgment of Paris); parallels with Heywood's later translations from Ovid and with his plays; echoes of Shakespeare in his plays; and so on. Some of these arguments may perhaps be discounted a little. Almost every Elizabethan author had a classical education quite adequate for this piece. And while Heywood made later use of Lucian, and may have done so here, a cursory reading discloses no un-Ovidian items in the picture of the judgment of Paris which might not have come from, say, Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* and *Tale of Troy*. However, there seems to be no other candidate for the authorship, and the positive case for Heywood is strong; incidentally, his view of plagiarism must have altered considerably in later years. *Oenone and Paris* is not important in itself and must take a humble place in the long list of Elizabethan pieces of the kind, but since it has been inaccessible and has some adventitious interest, we may welcome this careful edition.

DOUGLAS BUSH

Harvard University

*Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates (Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo)* translated with introduction and prefatory notes by LANE COOPER. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1941. Pp. ix + 200. In this volume, Professor Cooper offers a new translation of the four dialogues dealing with the trial and death of Socrates, with a somewhat general preface to each dialogue, an introduction to the whole, and a chronological table. In such a translation, one looks for accuracy and readability, and the standards here are on the whole well satisfied. There are, however, a few slips in translation, and rather more numerous failures in felicity. In *Euthyphro* (11e p. 32) the phrase "are languid" for *τρυφᾶν* is bad, and gives a false sound to the entire paragraph in which it stands. In *Crito* (44e p. 85) *συκοφάγται* is mistranslated "sycophants." In other cases, an attempt to follow the Greek too closely has led to a misunderstanding of the real meaning of the original. Thus, in *Apology* (20ab p. 52) we find: "Callias . . . if your two sons had been colts or calves, we should have no trouble in finding someone to look after them . . . but now that they are human beings . . ." Here the Greek *νῦν δ'* serves, as so often, to mark the speaker's return from a contrary-to-fact supposition to things as they really are; the translation is a distortion. The same fault is seen more clearly in the following (*Crito* 45e p. 85): "I am ashamed, both for you and for all of us your friends, for fear the whole affair concerning you *may seem*, etc." (italics mine). Here *αἰσχύνομαι μὴ δοξεῖν* is rendered with a kind of false fidelity the inaccuracy of which is betrayed by the fact that it necessitates an impossible English construction. Again: "The day before the trial it happened that the prow was crowned with laurel of the ship which the Athenians send to Delphi" (*Phaedo* 58a p. 111). Apart from the facts that "prow" should be "stern" (*πρύμνα*) and that "Delphi" should be "Delos," this sentence is quite unnecessarily awkward. Such faults are major blemishes, but are fortunately not too frequent in what is on the whole a very readable rendering.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE

Bryn Mawr College

---

*Studies in the Comic.* By B. H. BRONSON, J. R. CALDWELL, W. H. DURHAM, B. H. LEHMAN, GORDON MCKENZIE, and J. F. ROSS. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1941. Pp. 148. Here are six undocumented essays on Shakespeare, Swift, Gay, Sterne, "the solemn Romantics," and Dickens. Each is concerned with comic, humorous, or satirical aspects of the several authors; but the writers do not arrive at any agreement concerning the general nature of comedy. In Shakespeare, the comic is related to a perception of incongruities between appearance and

reality (W. H. Durham); in Gay, it is playful on the surface, but intimates that society, high and low, is steeped in rascality (B. H. Bronson); and in Dickens it closely resembles the sarcastic black-and-white artistry of the French caricaturist Daumier (Gordon McKenzie). In the case of the Romantics, after barring Byron and Lamb from the discussion, we find the few attempts to be merry very awkward indeed: to them the realm of the comic, i. e., the chaotic and anomalous, were merely fanciful; they were preoccupied with the ideal and harmonious (J. R. Caldwell).

B. H. Bronson's essay is an admirable appreciation of *The Beggar's Opera*. J. F. Ross's study of the fourth voyage of *Gulliver's Travels* is fundamentally sound in its insistence that we are not to regard Gulliver's views identical with those of Swift, but I do not believe that such a misinterpretation has been as common as Dr. Ross supposes. B. H. Lehman's "Of Time, Personality, and the Author" points out that the attitudes and purposes of Sterne, especially in *Tristram Shandy*, have become clearer to us than to his contemporaries. Readers of our day, acquainted with Joyce and Proust, can better appreciate an author who tries, like Sterne, to present human realities without moral preconceptions, to free himself from clock-measured one-way time, and to portray not logically consistent characters but complex emotional personalities.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

*University of Illinois*

*The Educational Theories of John Ruskin.* By HILDA BOETTCHER HAGSTOTZ. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1942. Pp. 294. \$2.50. That John Ruskin should have had much to say on the subject of education was almost foreordained. Few indeed can have been subjected to a more relentless and thorough drill than this only son of a father thirty-four years of age and a mother thirty-eight at the time of his birth. All readers of *Praeterita* know the story. Many have wondered how young John survived. He did, however, with profit to himself and to the world. If for no other reason it is valuable to listen to his own criticism of his experience and to observe how in his own teaching he turned it to advantage.

This is not the first published study of Ruskin's educational theories, but it is the most thorough. The completion in 1912 of the great Cook and Wedderburn edition of Ruskin's *Works* in thirty-nine volumes opened the way for a more elaborate evaluation of his pronouncements on the subject, and Dr. Hagstotz has made much of the opportunity. Her book serves as an admirable index to the educational theories scattered throughout Cook and Wedderburn, and as a good commentary upon them. No matter what the

source of his thought, anything that Ruskin says has been transformed in his mind, and comes forth with Ruskinian accent. As one who believes that in this day even more than heretofore Ruskin's remarks on education are timely and vital, I take pleasure in commending this study to all who wish to become acquainted with a man whose casual sayings, sometimes wayward or mocking, frequently contain as much of wisdom as the more studied utterances of lesser minds.

WALDO H. DUNN

*Scripps College*

*The Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer.* Selected and edited by E. J. HOWARD and G. D. WILSON. Revised and corrected edition. The Anchor Press: Oxford, Ohio, 1942. Pp. xxxii + 199. \$1.20. This book will be useful in introductory courses where there is little emphasis on a study of the language, and where instructors will be glad to have the Tale of Sir Thopas and the Franklin's Tale, among others, made accessible. For any thoroughgoing study, however, the many prologues included will not compensate for the omission of the Knight's Tale and the Clerk's Tale; the grammatical introduction and the notes will need very considerable expansion; and the glossary will require further apparatus and some changes. The text, as far as I have examined it, appears to be based on Manly's edition (though, as I happen to note, it is a pity the corrected form "Lyvia," Wife of Bath's Pro. 747, was not included). The book on the whole has rather too many errors: for example, in the case of Sercambi (p. xxvii) the pilgrims do not tell the tales as seems to be here implied; *lengthe* and *reste* (p. xxx) are not good examples for the petrified dative inasmuch as they take an *e* in other constructions (*lengthe* probably derives from the Old English form ending in a vowel, and *reste* comes from the Old English feminine); *daungerous* (p. 134) is not well glossed as "severe," nor is "sowded" (p. 192) "inclined towards," nor "elyyssh" (p. 142) "elflike"; the *Somnium Scipionis* (p. 150) is, as the editors undoubtedly know, paraphrased in the *Parliament*; with regard to the relic at the Abbey at Hales (p. 155) there seems to have been something actually in the vial which purported to be blood; the introduction overemphasizes the corruption of the medieval Church and fails to take account adequately of its achievements in educational and artistic matters as well as its spiritual gains (as indeed it makes too much of Madame Eglantine's worldliness considering the quality of her narrative).

HOWARD R. PATCH

*Smith College*

*Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici, an unpublished manuscript of Geoffroy Tory of the genealogy of the Counts of Boulogne concerning the French ancestry of Catherine de Medici, Queen of France.* Edited by GUSTAVE COHEN. Translated from the French by SAMUEL A. IVES. New York: H. P. Kraus, 1944. Pp. 50. \$2.75. Henri IV's first wife used to refer to his second as your "belle banquise." The king might have retorted that his first wife's mother was also a Medici and similarly tainted with membership in a family of merchants. He may have been restrained by the fact that Catherine had tried to cleanse her scutcheon by insisting on the descent of her mother, Madeleine de Bourges, from Legier, nephew of no less a person than "Artus Roy de Bretaigne." In proof whereof *La Généalogie des Comtes de Boulongne* came into existence in 1531. The manuscript, prepared in all probability, as M. Cohen indicates, by Geoffroy Tory, passed into the hands of Thomas Astle (1735-1903), then into those of the Earl of Leicester (1775-1811), subsequently into the collection of Mr. Kraus at 64 East 55th St. It has now been reproduced in French, with two pages devoted to facsimiles, and is preceded by M. C.'s learned introduction, translated by Mr. Ives into English that is at times unfortunately Gallic. The brochure is beautifully printed and illustrated. It is one that would have given pleasure to Queen Catherine and should attract the friends of her mother's country.

H. C. L.

---

*Urbane Travelers, 1591-1635.* By BOIES PENROSE, F. R. G. S. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, and London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. x + 251. \$3.00. *Fulke Greville's Caelica: An Evaluation.* By WILLIAM FROST. Brattleboro, Vermont: Privately Printed, 1942. Pp. vi + 62. \$1.00. Mr. Penrose's *Urbane Travelers* deals with seven Englishmen who travelled widely between 1591 and 1635: Fynes Moryson, John Cartwright, Thomas Coryate, William Lithgow, George Sandys, Sir Thomas Herbert, and Sir Henry Blount. Besides giving a biographical sketch of each, the author traces his itinerary in detail and summarizes his impressions. On the whole, the essays are entertaining; their chief value to students of Elizabethan and Jacobean life lies in the description of several representative English personalities and numerous typically English attitudes. The reader who does not know the writings of the travellers at first hand would, however, doubtless be willing to sacrifice geographical minutiae in favor of fuller quotations from the originals.

As an attempt to remove Greville from the shadow of Sidney's reputation and show that he merits more attention than he commonly receives, Mr. Frost's monograph is welcome. In his charac-

teristic manner of thought, Greville frequently resembles the Metaphysicals more than Sidney, and his metaphors and vocabulary are often readily close to everyday life. In fact, an even fuller exposition of these points and a more searching analysis of Greville's relation to various intellectual movements of his time could profitably replace the attention given such nonessentials as the number of dining rooms in Warwick Castle and a summary of Lee's history of the sonnet.

ROLAND B. BOTTING

*The State College of Washington*

---

*Annals of the New York Stage, XIII (1885-1888).* By GEORGE C. D. ODELL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. xviii + 723. \$8.75. With this volume Professor Odell approaches the beginnings of the modern American theatre. There are many persons in our generation who remember the plays and most certainly the players whose early careers are here recorded. Kyrle Bellew, Otis Skinner, John Drew, May Irwin, Ada Rehan, Richard Mansfield, E. H. Sothern, J. Forbes-Robertson, Mary Anderson, Modjeska, Lillian Russell, Francis Wilson, Clara Morris, McIntyre and Heath, Salvini, Rose Coghlan, Nat Goodwin, Effie Shannon, Sidney Drew, De Wolf Hopper, James A. Herne, Henry Miller, David Belasco—these names are still fresh enough to remind us that theatre-going in America was not so long ago an exciting adventure. The three years covered by this volume were full of varied theatrical and musical activity. Professor Odell's diligent research opens windows into our past and helps us understand not only the traditions that have faded, but those that are still factors in our dramatic writing, acting, and criticism. The amount of material—playbills, illustrations, and quotations from contemporary reviews—assembled here is prodigious. Historians of the American drama and theatre, of American culture in general, will forever be indebted to Professor Odell.

N. BRYLLION FAGIN

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*A Comparison between the Two Stages: A Late Restoration Book of the Theatre.* Edited by STARING B. WELLS. Princeton Studies in English, xxvi. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. xxii + 206. \$3.00. Into his ninety-eight pages of notes Dr. Wells has packed a great deal of information about the last phase of the Restoration theater. His introduction includes a judicious estimate of the anonymous author, "one of the critickins of the day"—the ascription to Gildon

is rejected. *A Comparison* illustrates the "close relationship between neo-classical criticism and the spirit of reform in the development and popularization of the moralizing drama of the eighteenth century." Mr. Wells's chief service is of course in making his text more widely available; this is the first reprint since its original appearance in 1702. Students of English drama and of eighteenth-century criticism will welcome the opportunity of adding this excellent volume to their shelves.

H. S.

---

*Selected Poems of Sir William Davenant.* With a prefatory note by DOUGLAS BUSH. Cambridge, Mass.: Geoffrey Bush, The Willow Press, 1943. Pp. 43. \$2.00. In this little book, Professor Bush reprints some verses from *Madagascar*, the *Works* of 1673, and from the plays. The selections are well chosen and reveal all the poetical facets of Davenant. Good taste, however, runs through Professor Bush's family, for the volume, handset and printed by his own son, is one of the finest examples of printing that I have seen in a long while. I especially commend it to all lovers of fine printing and to those directors of university presses, who delight in exalting poets to their own "bad eminence" by sending them forth clad in an inelegant format.

D. C. A.

---

*Experiments in Education.* By LANE COOPER. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1943. Pp. ix + 176. \$2.50. (Cornell Studies in English, Vol. XXXIII). This is a collection of fourteen addresses, essays, and pedagogical advices by one of the most learned and influential teachers of our day. The last ten chapters which are devoted to course plans and teaching hints are required reading for all teachers of language and literature. From these essays one gathers not only valuable advice but an important lesson—Professor Cooper was never satisfied with the way a course was taught; he sought always for a new and better method; he was not afraid to experiment. That knowledge is a good antidote for the inflexible complacency that comes over so many of us after we have passed "il mezzo del cammin di nostra vita." The volume concludes with a bibliography of Professor Cooper's writings.

D. C. A.

## CORRESPONDENCE

NOCH EINMAL: "WES DAS HERZ VOLL IST." In einem früheren Heft der *MLN.*<sup>1</sup> hat W. Kurrelmeyer für Luthers berühmte Verdeutschung der *Vulgata*-Stelle "*Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*" eine sieben Jahre ältere Parallele nachgewiesen. In der von Pauli stammenden Fassung des Geilerschen *Evangelibuch* heißt es zwar: *was das hertz vol ist, des loufft der mund vber* statt des Lutherschen *gehet vber*, aber die beiden Prägungen sind einander zu ähnlich, als daß sie zweimal unabhängig voneinander entstanden sein könnten. Mit Recht betont aber Kurrelmeyer den umgangssprachlichen Charakter der Wendung, auf den ja auch Luther im *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* anspielt. Sie ist niemandes Eigentum, und die Frage ist offen geblieben, ob sie Luthern aus Geilers Schrift zugeflossen sei oder von wo anders.

Ich glaube, sie ist zu beantworten. In Hieronymus Emsers *Quadruplica auf Luters Jungst gethane antwort, sein reformation belangend* heißt es auf Seite 131 des Neudrucks:<sup>2</sup> "dann wie Christus vnd das gemeyn sprichwort sagt, was das hertz vol ist, gehet der mund vber, ex cordis enim abundantia os loquitur, Mathei XII." Die an Luther gerichtete *Quadruplica* erreichte ihren Adressaten Anfang Juli 1522,<sup>3</sup> das heißt grade in dem Augenblick, da die Übersetzung der Evangelien Luthers ganze Aufmerksamkeit in Anspruch nahm. Leicht möglich, daß die Plastik der sprichwörtlichen Wendung in Emsers Kampfschrift sie Luthern empfahl. Er wird sie ohnehin gekannt haben, aber durch Emsers Anwendung wurde sie ihm handgerecht.

Das Pikante dieser Situation liegt darin, daß Luther acht Jahre später im *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* grade gegen Emser "seine eigene" Version der Matthäus-Stelle verteidigt: "Wenn ich den Eseln sol folgen, die werden mir die buchstaben furlegen, und also dolmetzchen: Auf dem überflus des hertzen redet der mund." Der Hauptesel, den er dabei im Auge hat, hatte aber Luthern selbst die prächtige Wendung in den Mund gelegt, auf die sich nun Luther so viel zu gute tut. Er selber hatte den Tatbestand inzwischen vergessen, Emser war durch den Tod gehindert, sein Besitzrecht geltend zu machen.

Er hatte ja auch keines. Wir lernen von Emser, daß—wie Kurrelmeyer schon richtig vermutet hatte—hier ein *gemeyn sprichwort* vorliegt, gebraucht von der *mutter ym haus*, dem *gemeinen mann in der strassen*, sogar den *Eseln* im katholischen Lager.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

Kenyon College

<sup>1</sup> *MLN.*, L (1935), 380-382.

<sup>2</sup> "Luther und Emser. Ihre Streitschriften aus dem Jahre 1521" hrsg. von Ludwig Enders. Bd. II, 1892. [Braunes Neudrucke No. 96-98.]

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. das Vorwort der Neudrucks S. IX.

## WORTH BOTH HIS EARS

Were þe bischop yblissed · and worth bothe his eres  
 His seal shulde nouȝt be sent · to deceyue þe peple.

*Piers Plowman*, B-text, Prologue 78-9.

The gloss "fit to *keep* both his ears," suggested by Hazelton Spencer (*MLN*, LVIII, 48) is surely no improvement on Skeat's explanation. The meaning of the line is clear when it is considered along with the rest of the passage down to line 82. Line 68, which introduces the pardoner, contains a charge against him which Langland thought quite as important as the common charge of imposing upon the credulity of poor people. This charge was that he preached "as he a priest were," that is he exceeded the terms of the licence he received from the bishop in assuming the status of priest. This his licence did not entitle him to do. If the bishop were "yblissed," that is a truly holy man, he would enquire more closely into the characters of those to whom licences were issued. He would not grant licenses to those who would misuse them; he would take some thought to the spiritual side of the matter instead of issuing licences indiscriminately for the sake of revenue. If he were "worth both his ears," worthy to have both his ears because he made proper use of them, he would soon learn of the abuses practised by the pardoners, and would learn also how they were exceeding the limits of the authority granted them by the licences. The complaints would probably come not mainly from the poor, as Skeat suggests, but from the conscientious parish priests who would not come to terms with the pardoners.

Langland then returns to his first point:

Ac it is nauȝt by þe bischop · þat þe boy precheth,  
 For the parisch prest and þe pardoner · parten þe siluer  
 That þe poraille of þe parisch · sholde haue ȝif þei nere.

In the interpretation of "by þe bischop" Skeat seems to have missed the point. He suggests that this means "Yet it is not against the bishop that the young fellow preaches" (ed. E. E. T. S., Part IV, sect. i, 1877, p. 13). It is so improbable that the pardoner would preach against the bishop that there would be little sense in denying that he did so, and Langland did not waste words in this fashion. The lines mean that the pardoner did not preach, that is assume the function of priest, by any permission of the bishop. The bishop's licence did not allow him to preach. Why, then, did he? The answer follows: because the parish priest came to terms with this troublesome competitor and would allow him even the use of his pulpit providing he shared in the pardoner's winnings. The assumption of priestly authority would of course add to the pardoner's prestige in the eyes of the common people and increase his profits. It is the parish priest and not the bishop that is responsible for much of the mischief. "Boy" here means not simply "young fellow," but "scoundrel" or "rogue" (see the article by E. J. Dobson, *Medium Aevum*, IX, 121).

*The University of Sydney*

A. G. MITCHELL

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

**Bush, Douglas, ed.** — Selected poems of Sir William Davenant. *Cambridge*: The Willow Press, 1943. Pp. viii + 43. \$2.00.

**Corson, James Clarkson.** — A bibliography of Sir Walter Scott. *Edinburgh and London*: Oliver and Boyd, 1943. Pp. xvi + 428. 32/-.

**Department of English, The University of Texas.** — Studies in English. *Austin*: The University of Texas Press, 1943. Pp. 192.

**Jones, Daniel.** — An English pronouncing dictionary, containing 54,860 words in international phonetic transcription. *New York*: E. P. Dutton, 1943. Pp. xxx + 496.

## FRENCH

**Baldensperger, F.** — Une Vie parmi d'autres. Notes pour servir à la chronologie de notre temps. *Paris*: Conard, 1940. 380 pp.

**Béguin, Albert.** — La Prière de Pégy. 1942.

**Bougier, Marie.** — Essai sur la renaissance de la poésie catholique de Baudelaire à Claudel. 1942.

**Buenzod, Emmanuel.** — Une époque littéraire (1890-1910).

**Calvet, J.** — Bossuet, l'homme et l'œuvre. 1941.

**Charpentier, John.** — Molière. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1942.

**Cocteau, Jean.** — Racine. 1941.

**Cohen, G. (ed.).** — Geoffroy Tory and Catherine de Medici, an unpubl. MS. of G. T. of the Genealogy of the Counts of Boulogne. *New York*: H. P. Kraus, 1944. 50 pp. \$2.75.

**Faure-Biguet, J.-N.** — Les Enfances Montherlant, 1905-1906. *Paris*: Plon, 1941.

**Fouchet.** — Apollinaire le mal-aimé. *Algiers*: Charlot, 1942.

**Guichard, Léon.** — Sept études sur Marcel Proust. *Cairo*: Horus, 1942.

**Lalou, René.** — Le Roman français depuis 1900. *Paris*: Presses Universitaires.

**Lambert, Jean.** — Jean Schlumberger.

**Lauzière, Aimé.** — Le Lieutenant Psichari. *Paris*: La Bonne Presse, 1940.

**Mallarmé.** — Les Poèmes en prose, éd. Jean-Aubry. *Paris*: Emile-Paul, 1942.

**Manning, W. F.** — The Life of Saint Dominic in Old French Verse, critically edited. *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press, 1944.

xiv + 358 pp. \$4.00. (*Harvard Studies in Romance Langs.*, 20.)

**Mauron, Ch.** — Mallarmé l'obscur. 1941.

**Mayer, Gilbert.** — La Qualification affective dans les romans de Balzac. *Paris*: Droz, 1940.

**Nardin, Pierre.** — La Langue et le style de Jules Renard. 1942.

**Rimbaud, A.** — Une Saison en enfer, éd. Bouillane de Lacoste. 1941.

**Stendhal.** — Souvenirs d'égotisme, éd. H. Martineau. *Paris*: Le Divan, 1941.

**Thierry-Maulnier.** — Lecture de Racine. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. Fr., 1940.

**Van der Perre, Paul.** — Bibliographie des véritables éditions originales de Balzac publiées en Belgique. 1941.

**Wright, Edith A. (ed.).** — *Ystoire de la Passion* B. N. MS fr. 821. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1944. 78 pp. \$1.25. (J. H. Studies in Romance L. and L. 45.)

**Yvon, P.** — L'Influence de Flaubert en Angleterre. *Caen*: Caron, 1939.

## SPANISH

**Alarcón, Pedro Antonio de.** — Juicios literarios y artísticos. *Madrid*: Suárez, 1943. 302 pp.

**Alberti, Rafael.** — Antología poética (1924-40). *Buenos Aires*: Ed. Losada, 1942. 269 pp.

**Bretón de los Herreros.** — Teatro, ed. N. Alonso Cortés. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. xxxi + 239 pp.

**Cervantes.** — Obras completas, ed. A. Valbuena y Prat. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1943. xli + 1819 pp.

— Persiles y Sigismunda, ed. N. G. Ruiz Zaragoza: Edit. Ebro, 1943. 133 pp.

**Cesares, Julio.** — Cosas del lenguaje. Etiología. Lexicología. Semántica. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. 334 pp.

**Colford, W. E.** — Juan Meléndez Valdés. *New York*: Hispanic Inst., 1942. 369 pp. \$3.50.

**Covarrubias Orozco.** — Tesoro (1611), ed. Martín de Riquer. *Barcelona*: Horta, 1943. xv + 1093 pp.

**Díez Canedo, E.** — La nueva poesía. *Méjico*: El Nacional, 1942. 108 pp.

**Díez Mateo, F.** — Academo. Diccionario esp. etimológico del siglo XX. *Bilbao*: Artes Gráficas Grijelmo, 1943. xxiii + 735 pp.

**Díaz-Plaja, G.** — El lenguaje. *Barcelona*: La Espiga, 1940. 203 pp.

— Teoría e historia de los géneros literarios. *Ibid.*, 1940. 240 pp.

**Dominguez Becquer, G. A.** — Rimas y leyendas, ed. I. M. Gil. *Zaragoza*: Edit. Ebro, 1943. 125 pp.

D'Ors, Marañón, Zaragüeta, Carreras, Jobit, Genovés.—Vivés, humaniste esp. *Paris*: Plon, 1941. 114 pp.

Farinelli, Arturo.—Poesía del Montserrat y otros ensayos. *Barcelona*: Bosch, 1940. 165 pp.

Galdós.—Cartas a R. Mesonero Romanos, ed. E. Varela Hervías. *Madrid*: Artes Gráficas Municipales, 1943. 59 pp.

Gordón, I. de L. (ed.).—Estudios clásicos portuenses. *Cádiz*: Cerón, 1943. xv + 399 pp.

Juan de la Cruz.—Obras escogidas, ed. I. B. Anzoátegui. *Buenos Aires*: Espasa-Calpe, 1942. 151 pp.

Larra, M. J. de.—Artículos de crítica literaria y artística. II. Ed. J. R. Lomba y Pedraja. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1940. 272 pp.

López Osornio.—Las boleadoras. *Buenos Aires*: Eds. Católicas Argentinas, 1941. 62 pp.

Luzuriaga, L.—Antología de la literatura clásica esp. *Buenos Aires*: Ángel Estrada, 1941. 261 pp.

Manrique, Jorge.—Poesías amatorias y otras, ed. C. A. Leumann. *Buenos Aires*: Sopena Arg., 1941. 154 pp.

Marias, J.—Miguel de Unamuno. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1943. 225 pp.

Monreal Jaén, A.—El acento prosódico en algunas palabras italianas y en sus similares esporfiolas. *Gijón*: Escuela de Peritos industriales, 1943. 88 pp.

Pattison, W. T.—Representative Sp. Authors. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1942. xii + 501 + lxii pp.

Pereda.—Obras completas, ed., José María de Cossío. *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1943. xxxix + 2296 pp.

Ruiz de Alarcón.—Comedias, ed. J. Mallorquí Figuerola. *Buenos Aires*: Col. "Lit. Clásica," 1942. 221 pp.

Sáinz de Robles, F. C. (ed.).—El Teatro esp. Historia y Antología. T. VII (siglo XIX). *Madrid*: Aguilar, 1943. 1273 pp.

Scarpa, R. E.—Lecturas clásicas esp. *Santiago de Chile*: Zig-Zag, 1941. 751 pp.

Sepúlveda, J. G. de.—Antología, ed. Alonso del Real. *Barcelona*: 1940. 253 pp.

Suárez Falcón, J.—Galdós y el teatro contemporáneo. *Las Palmas*: T. E. M., 1943. 123 pp.

Tomás, T. Navarro.—Cuestionario lingüístico hispanoamericano. I. Fonética, Morfología, Sintaxis. *Buenos Aires*: Univ. de Buenos Aires, 1943. 113 pp.

Unamuno, M. de.—Poesías místicas, ed. J. Nieto Pena. *Madrid*: 1941. 60 pp.

Valbuena Prat, A.—Calderón. *Barcelona*: Ed. Juventud, 1941. 215 pp.

— El sentido católico en la literatura esp. *Barcelona*: Nasga, 1941. 186 pp.

Vega, Lope de.—Lírica, ed. E. Nadal. *Barcelona*: Montaner y Simón, 1943. xxvi + 207 pp.

— El niño inocente y La viva imagen de Cristo de José de Cañizares, ed. Manuel Romero de Castilla. *Madrid*: Juan Bravo, 1943. 121 pp.

— Peribáez; Fuente ovejuna; El mejor alcalde. Ed. J. Mallorquí Figuerola. *Buenos Aires*: Molino, 1941. 238 pp.

Zamora Lucas, F.—Lope de Vega, Censor de libros. *Larache*: Artes Gráficas y Ed. Boscá, 1943. 179 pp.

## PORTUGUESE

Camões.—Auto de El Rei Seleuco, ed. A. C. Pires de Lima. *Oporto*: Barreira, 1941. 117 pp.

Cardim, L.—Projecção de Camões nas lettras inglesas. *Lisbon*: Inquerito, 1940. 73 pp.

Coutinho, B. X.—Ensaios: Varia camonianas e outros estudos. *Oporto*: Lopes da Silva, 1941. viii + 254 pp.

Ferreira, Antonio.—Poesía, ed. M. Segalá Brosa. *Barcelona*: Yunque, 1940. 99 pp.

Melo Jorge, J. de.—Os tipos de Eça de Queiroz. *São Paulo*: Livraria Brasil, 1940.

Moraes Moraes, F. de.—Palmeirim de Inglaterra, ed. J. Martins. *Lisbon*: Avelar Machado, 1940. 94 pp.

Quenthal, Anthero de.—Poesía, ed. J. Pardo. *Barcelona*: Yunque, 1940. 99 pp.

Rodríguez de Mesa.—Poesías, ed. J. del Rosal. *Barcelona*: Yunque, 1940. 106 pp.

Rodrigues Lapa (ed.).—Poetas do século XVIII. *Lisbon*: Seara Nova, 1941. xv + 82 pp.

Sanches, E.—Lingua brasileira. *São Paulo*: Comp. Ed. Nacional, 1940. xlii + 340 pp.

Thomas, Henry.—Short-title Catalogue of Portuguese Books printed before 1801 now in the British Museum. *London*: British Museum, 1940. viii + 44 pp.

## GENERAL

Müller, V. K.—English-Russian Dictionary. New 1944 ed. *New York*: Dutton, 1944. 776 pp. \$3.00.

— Russian-English Dictionary. Third ed. *Ibid.*, 1944. 822 pp. \$3.00.

Pei, Mario A.—Languages for War and Peace. *New York*: S. F. Vanni, 1943. 575 pp.

Sieff, Mark.—Colloquial Russian. *New York*: Dutton, 1944. xxiv + 323 pp. \$2.50.

Vatnsdalers' Saga, The, translated by Gwyn Jones. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1944. vi + 158 pp. \$2.00.

4  
al.  
vi  
en  
el  
ro,  
or  
os  
or  
d:  
  
C.  
-l.  
as  
-o.  
na  
ra,  
lá  
de  
-o.  
ar  
ar  
J.  
el  
do  
+  
o:  
of  
ow  
sh  
  
y.  
76  
ed.  
nd  
op.  
ew  
50.  
by  
ess  
on,

i  
n  
l,  
r  
e  
d.  
  
C.  
C.  
s  
D.  
a  
a  
á  
le  
D.  
t  
r  
  
J.  
el  
lo  
+  
:  
of  
w  
sh  
  
y.  
76  
d.  
nd  
p.  
w  
50.  
oy  
ss  
n,

# University OF Cincinnati

PUBLISHED BY  
*Princeton University Press*  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

FOR THE

*University of Cincinnati*



**Allegory in the French Heroic Poem of the Seventeenth Century,** by ARCHIMEDE MARNI,  
211 pp., 1936. \$2.50

**The Bondman,** by PHILIP MASSINGER, edited by BENJAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER, 266 pp., 1932. \$3.00

**Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of Ben Jonson,** by CHARLES FRANCIS WHEELER, 220 pp., 1938. \$3.50

**God in Greek Philosophy to the Time of Socrates,** by ROY KENNETH HACK, 160 pp., 1931. \$3.00

**Ludwig Tieck and England,** by EDWIN H. ZEYDEL, 264 pp., 1931. \$2.75

**Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist,** by EDWIN H. ZEYDEL, 422 pp., 1935. o. p.

**Repetition in Shakespeare's Plays,** by PAUL V. KREIDER, 314 pp., 1941. \$3.50

**Seventeenth Century Studies,** edited by ROBERT SHAFFER (Philip Massinger, by BENJAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER; John Ford, by MARY EDITH COCHNOWER; Samuel Butler, by DAN GIBSON, JR.), 335 pp., 1933. \$3.50

**Seventeenth Century Studies: Second Series,** edited by ROBERT SHAFFER (Francis Osborn's "Advice to a Son," by SIGMUND A. E. BETZ; Dryden's Plays: A Study in Ideas, by MILDRED E. HARTSOCK; Jeremy Collier's Essays, by KATHLEEN RESSLER), 295 pp., 1937. \$3.50

**Horace Walpole: Gardenist,** by ISABEL WAKELIN URBAN CHASE. \$3.50

**The Liberal Mind of John Morley,** by WARREN STAEBLER. \$3.50

*A New, Up-to-date, Cultural Grammar for  
Next Fall's Classes*

HILLS, FORD, COUTINHO & MOFFATT'S

## PORTUGUESE GRAMMAR, Rev.

E. L. H.

Not only a revision but a complete rewriting of the Portuguese grammar that has been the leading standard during recent years. It provides thorough grammatical training with lessons centered about topics of cultural, historical, or current interest. The text gives students a background knowledge of Brazilian *realia* as a first preparation for actual contact with the people of Brazil. The last part of the book gives modern instruction in correct letter-writing, both personal and business.

*Forty-nine lessons and ten reviews. Extensive drill on forms and pronunciation with chief emphasis on Brazilian usage.*

---

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

---

## LA GRONE CONVERSATIONAL SPANISH FOR BEGINNERS

A beginning book in oral Spanish, developed in the freshman course at the University of Pennsylvania and the Area and Language course of the A. S. T. program at the same institution. It emphasizes the use of language in *living* situations.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

257 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, New York